

International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of and the Traffic in Obscene Publications, signed at Geneva September 12, 1923—Executive M, Sixty-eighth Congress, second session.

Protocol for the prohibition of the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warfare, signed at Geneva June 17, 1925—Executive G, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session.

Convention and protocol between the United States of America and Canada for the preservation and improvement of the Niagara Falls, signed at Ottawa January 2, 1929—Executive U, Seventieth Congress, second session.

Protocol of revision of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice—World Court—signed at Geneva September 14, 1929; protocol of signature of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, signed at Geneva December 16, 1920; and protocol of accession of the United States of America to the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice, signed at Geneva September 14, 1929—Executive A, Seventy-first Congress, third session.

Treaty between the United States of America and Canada for the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Deep Waterway, signed at Washington July 18, 1932—Executive C, Seventy-second Congress, second session.

Bern Convention of September 9, 1886, for the protection of literary and artistic works, revised at Berlin, November 13, 1908, and at Rome, June 2, 1928—Executive E, Seventy-third Congress, second session.

International convention for the suppression of the traffic in women of full age, opened for signature at Geneva October 11, 1933—Executive H, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session.

Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Argentina with reference to sanitary regulations concerning plant and animal products, signed at Washington May 24, 1935—Executive O, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session.

International convention relating to economic statistics and a protocol thereto, signed at Geneva December 14, 1928—Executive S, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session.

Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama for the regulation of radio communications in the Republic of Panama and the Canal Zone, signed at Washington March 2, 1936—Executive C, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session.

International convention for the unification of certain rules to govern the liability of vessels when collisions occur between them, and a protocol thereto, signed at Brussels September 23, 1910—Executive K, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session.

Draft convention, No. 56, concerning sickness insurance for seamen, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-first session, held at Geneva October 6 to 24, 1936—Executive Y, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session.

Draft convention, No. 61, concerning the reduction of hours of work in the textile industry, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-third session, held at Geneva June 3 to 23, 1937—Executive J, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session.

Draft convention, No. 63, concerning statistics of wages and hours of work in the principal mining and manufacturing industries, including building and construction, and in agriculture, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-fourth session, held at Geneva June 2 to 22, 1938—Executive L, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session.

International sanitary convention, signed at Paris October 31, 1938—Executive J, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

Convention for the establishment of an inter-American bank, signed on behalf of the United States of America May 10, 1940—Executive K, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

Convention between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland providing for the exemption of taxation on property or transactions connected with defense, signed at Washington October 17, 1941—Executive H, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session.

Supplementary protocol concerning whaling signed at London October 5, 1945—Executive J, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 8, 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar, with the exception of those to be voted on tomorrow.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edgar E. Witt, of Texas, to be Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William M. Holt, of Nebraska, to be Associate Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Louis J. O'Marr, of Wyoming, to be Associate Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Wesley Thompson Falkner IV to be United States marshal for the northern district of Mississippi.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

Without objection, the President will be notified immediately of all nominations this day confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know of no further business to come before the Senate at this time, so I move, as in legislative session, that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 9, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 8 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Edwin A. Plitt, of Maryland, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Marshall Sylvester Carter (captain, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 8 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Edgar E. Witt to be Chief Commissioner. William M. Holt to be an Associate Commissioner.

Louis J. O'Marr to be an Associate Commissioner.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John Wesley Thompson Falkner IV to be United States marshal for the northern district of Mississippi.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, to Thee, who art the author of our liberty, and under whom we have our freedom, we make our prayer. Make us ever mindful of the price that was paid to obtain that freedom and the cost that must be met to keep it. Help us in this Nation so to live it that other men shall desire it and seek after it. Believing in it, give us the backbone to stand up for it. Loving it, may we be willing to defend it. In the strong name of Him who said, "If ye continue in My word, ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 8, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—NOTICE OF SPEECH

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I assume that the debate will progress on the pending bill to provide aid to Greece and Turkey. I should like to say that if I can obtain recognition tomorrow when the Senate convenes, I desire to address myself to that bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will take notice of the suggestion, and it will be responded to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will go into executive session at 5 o'clock, and, without further debate, proceed to vote on the nominations of the various members of the Atomic Energy Commission and of the General Manager.

At the moment the question before the Senate is on agreeing to the first amendment to Senate bill 938, to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the chairman of the Public Lands Committee, that a subcommittee of that committee, to wit, on irrigation and reclamation, be permitted to hold hearings this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order will be made respecting the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I ask permission that the committee may hold a meeting this afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security of the Appropriations Committee may meet this afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the sessions of the Senate on Thursday and Friday of this week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, consent of the Senate is given.

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a certified copy of a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to continue the availability of funds provided for airport construction in Hawaii as legalized by Public Law 377, Seventy-ninth Congress

"Whereas from news dispatches it has come to the attention of members of the Territorial Legislature now assembled that it has been suggested by a subcommittee of the United States Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that funds provided for improvements of airports during the year 1947 be diverted and used for aircraft aids and safety devices; and

"Whereas the transportation of persons and island produce between the islands is becoming more and more dependent on air transportation; and

"Whereas in order to furnish the necessary facilities for airplane operations so that the transportation of island produce and persons may be more efficiently handled, the Territory has looked with great favor on the national airport program and has provided funds with which to match Federal funds on the improvement of Kalaupapa Airport, Lanai Airport, Lihue Airport, Hana Airport, and Kailua Airport, and has under study the provision for additional funds for the improvement of other airports; and

"Whereas due to the ideal flying conditions within the Territory of Hawaii such aids and safety devices are not required to be installed here; and

"Whereas if the diversion of funds allocated or to be allocated to the Territory are to be expended for such aids this community will neither receive its just share of funds provided for it under Public Law 377, nor will it be able to proceed with its airport-improvement program now being planned: Now therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to make no changes in funds provided for airport construction under the provisions of Public Law 377, Seventy-ninth Congress, insofar as the purpose of expenditure of such fund within the Territory of Hawaii.

"Sec. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall forthwith be forwarded to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii; the Secretary of the Interior; Hon. WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; and to each of the two Houses of the Congress of the United States.

"Sec. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 3d day of April A. D. 1947.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the Townsend Clubs of the Sixth Congressional District of Florida, West Palm Beach, Fla., praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THYE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to continue the agricultural conservation program under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the conservation assistance to Minnesota farmers under that program

"Whereas the proper land utilization and conservation of soil resources of this State are necessary for its prosperity and agricultural development; and

"Whereas 90 percent of the farmers of this State farm 80 percent of the land and participate in this program; and

"Whereas financial assistance to farmers through a soil building program of national scope is necessary to productive soil for the benefit of generations of farmers; and

"Whereas the present form of administration of this program is entirely satisfactory to the farmers of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Minnesota (the Senate concurring) memorialize the Congress of the United States to continue the agricultural conservation program under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and not to reduce conservation assistance to Minnesota farmers under that program nor remove the local authorities from the administration of said program; be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be instructed to send copies of this resolution to each Minnesota Member of Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President of the United States."

PRACTICE BOMBING IN MARTHA'S VINEYARD AREA—EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the news that the Navy plans to practice bombing on the island of Martha's Vineyard has caused a great deal of consternation. I express the hope that upon reconsideration they will decide not to conduct bombing in that area. I ask to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, an

editorial from the Boston Express, and another from the Vineyard Gazette, Marthas Vineyard, Mass., on that particular topic.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Express of April 7, 1947]

VINEYARD BOMBING

The Marthas Vineyard area would seem to be a poor place in which to carry out practice bombing. In response to protests from that section, the Navy has ordered a stop to such operations pending investigation. With the approach of the vacation season, such bombing becomes particularly unwelcome and even dangerous. It is hoped that the investigation planned by the Navy will bring a permanent halt to the Marthas Vineyard bombing.

[From the Vineyard Gazette, Marthas Vineyard, Mass., of March 28, 1947]

ILL WILL AND THE NAVY

The reinstatement of naval air targets in Tisbury Grea Pond and Squibnocket Pond will restore a wartime state of affairs certain to be bitterly resented on the Vineyard. We had thought that we were through with bombings and bombing runs for a while. It goes without saying that these naval air activities are incompatible with the normal pursuits by which Marthas Vineyard earns its living—fishing and recreation—and with the safe use of natural resources here.

During the war it often seemed that the Navy deliberately and unnecessarily chose areas for target bombing and other exercises which would disturb civilian life. While the war was in progress nobody kicked. But the close view which the public thus gained of various Navy activities built up adverse opinion and an awareness of wasted money and matériel. This feeling on the part of so many patriotic citizens is a liability the Navy could have avoided.

A continuation of the wartime program will intensify and increase public ill will, and we doubt if the Navy can afford such a burden. Certainly a sound policy would be to develop a feeling of partnership and understanding.

It is perfectly obvious that the coast, at no great distance from Quonset Point, affords areas which can be used for bombing without offense and without danger to civilian flying and civilian pursuits. We hope the Navy will make use of such areas promptly, and abandon its ill-advised program for an island which is one of the most important resort areas of the United States.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1071. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Shadrick Ponca; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 1072. A bill to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1073. A bill to extend until June 30, 1949, the period of time during which persons may serve in certain executive departments and agencies without being prohibited from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting claims against the United

States by reason of having so served; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1074. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 1075. A bill for the relief of Thomas Tohru Ogawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1076. A bill to amend section 7 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. CORDON introduced Senate bill 1077, to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to authorize commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to preside at the taking of evidence in proceedings under section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BUTLER introduced Senate bill 1078, to provide a civil government for the island of Guam, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 1079. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1925, as amended (18 U. S. C. 725); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. CAIN):

S. 1080. A bill to authorize temporarily the voluntary transfer of newsprint used by the publishing industry of the United States notwithstanding the provisions of the antitrust laws; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. 1081. A bill to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CAPPER (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution designating the period from Thanksgiving to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for reference to the Committee on the Judiciary a bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to authorize commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to preside at the taking of evidence in proceedings under section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Administrative Procedure Act contains, among other provisions, a requirement that all examiners of fact be civilians. In connection with the Coast Guard that provision of law will require the employment of a considerable number of civilian examiners in cases arising under the provisions of law which require the Coast Guard, among other things, to conduct disciplinary proceedings looking to the suspension or revocation of seamen's licenses or certificates on grounds of incompetence, misbehavior, negligence, unskillfulness, endangering of life, or violation of various laws and regulations governing the merchant marine.

Mr. President, it will be a waste of money to require the Coast Guard to employ civilian examiners because in many instances their time cannot be fully occupied in the work for which they would have to be employed, and their time would be utterly wasted. Quite evidently, the situation as it now exists was not foreseen at the time that the Administrative Procedure Act was before the committee and was enacted into law. The Coast Guard will require about \$280,000 annually in addition to its other necessities in order to maintain this group of civilian examiners. If, on the other hand, the Administrative Procedure Act can be amended so as to exclude the Coast Guard from its operation in connection with this handling of inspection of merchant marine this amount can be saved each year.

The bill I am introducing provides for exemption of the Coast Guard officers from the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. I particularly call the attention of any members of the Committee on the Judiciary to the amendment, and I hope they will expedite its consideration.

This is one of the situations which continually confronts the Appropriations Committee. We are faced with requests for funds which have been authorized, funds which are needed unless substantive law can be changed, and I feel it to be the duty of the members of the several subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, as rapidly as situations of that character come to their attention, to attempt corrections in substantive law so as to bring the law into proper relationship with the appropriate matters under the control and supervision of that committee. I ask particular attention of the Committee on the Judiciary to the bill which I have just introduced.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1077) to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to authorize commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to preside at the taking of evidence in proceedings under section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CORDON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR GUAM

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a little more than 2 months ago I introduced a joint resolution which had as its purpose the establishment of civil government in our Pacific islands. My resolution suggested that the President proclaim interim civil governments in Guam and American Samoa and in the former Japanese mandated islands. That resolution resulted, Mr. President, from my conviction that it is high time for the United States to provide a form of civil government for the civilian populations on the Pacific islands.

At the time I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 51 I was not unmindful of the fact that the President already has all the authority he needs to establish temporary civil administrations in these island areas. He could have established

interim civil governments for these peoples with a stroke of his pen. In fact my resolution was intended as a form of Congressional approval of that authority as well as an indication of Congressional disapproval of the continued government of civilian populations by military governments in Guam and American Samoa. It was also notice to him that at least one Member of the Senate of the United States favored the early establishment of civil governments for the civilian populations of the mandated islands.

Mr. President, my hopes have not materialized. The President has indicated no desire to establish civil governments in these islands. At the very moment that the President is stumping for democracy in Greece and Turkey to the tune of \$400,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money, he is perpetuating a form of American military autocracy which has existed under the executive authority of the President for almost 50 years. While he bemoans the fate of democracy in Greece, he ignores the cries of some 40,000 American nationals in Guam and American Samoa who have not known democracy in all the years they have been under the American flag. At the very moment that he invokes the ghost of Jefferson to bless the campaign for democracy in Greece, he blithely ignores every tenet of Jefferson's philosophy of government as it should apply to our own possessions. While he exhorts Americans to fight totalitarianism in Europe, he deliberately overlooks the military dictatorships which exist on his own authority in Guam and American Samoa.

In article IX of the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898, the United States pledged herself to define the civil rights and political status of the local inhabitants of the islands which were ceded to us by other provisions of that same treaty. We have fulfilled our pledge with respect to Puerto Rico. We have gone far beyond our pledge with respect to the Philippine Islands. We have utterly disregarded our pledge with respect to the island of Guam. Since 1898 the American Congress has stood by while the executive branch of our Government has ruled the island through naval officers in whom it has vested plenary powers of local government. For almost half a century the executive, legislative, and judicial powers of local government in the island of Guam have been combined in one man who at the same time has been military commandant of the island.

The naval officers who have served as Governors of Guam have, as a rule, been kindly and considerate. Their errors have on the whole resulted from an overzealous regard for the welfare of a people, who through the years have been regarded as wards of the United States Navy. The wrong, Mr. President, is in the system itself—not in the individuals who execute it. It is the naval governments of Guam and American Samoa which are undemocratic and un-American. They are absolutisms beyond compare. We should act now to eliminate

these monstrosities from the American system.

It was during my Pacific inspection tour of several months ago that I became acutely aware of the enormity of the wrong we have perpetrated on the people of Guam since 1898. To this date I have hesitated to take action to correct that wrong because I feared that public criticism of the form of government we have imposed on these people might serve only to invite attention to this blot on the record of American democracy. I have now changed my mind. The time has come for action from this end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

To that purpose, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill which I hope will become an organic act for the island of Guam. It is a bill which will give to Guam the same democracy which other Americans enjoy. It is the Senate counterpart of a bill recently introduced in the House by Representative NORRIS POULSON, a California Republican. In introducing this bill, Mr. President, I am endorsing the principle that there must be civil governments for civilian populations under the American flag in time of peace. I am endorsing that principle as it applies to Guam and American Samoa and the other Pacific islands which have been placed in our trust by the United Nations.

How can we preach—or should I say purchase—democracy in the Near East when we practice autocracy in the Far East? How can we advocate democracy for the Greeks and the Turks when we practice autocracy on our own nationals? How can we stand before the world as champions of the democratic way of life while we perpetuate military absolutisms in our own non-self-governing territories? Mr. President, I am proud to give my name and my support to a measure which will extend the basic human freedoms of the Constitution and laws of the United States to the 23,000 loyal American nationals and the many American citizens who live under the American flag on the island of Guam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point an editorial from the New York Times, entitled "News From Guam," which strongly urges enactment of some such measure as the one I am introducing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial presented by the Senator from Nebraska will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1078) to provide a civil government for the island of Guam, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The editorial presented by Mr. BUTLER and ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

[From the New York Times of April 7, 1947]

NEWS FROM GUAM

A report of the Eighth Guam Congress, recently come to hand, offers convincing evi-

dence of the ability of the people of that island to deal with public affairs in an orderly and competent manner. A joint session of the House of Council and the House of Assembly debated several controversial measures having to do with the rebuilding of Agaña, including the allotment of land and the zoning for business and light industry. One by one the disputed points were disposed of by reasonable compromise. A proposed petition to the Navy Governor of Guam requesting the setting aside of 10 percent of tax collections to provide scholarships in the United States for Guamanians choosing professional studies, such as medicine and law, was carried over for further consideration when some members found flaws in the petition as worded. A communication was received from Navy Governor Rear Adm. J. A. Pownall, acceding to their request that all ordinances for governance of the island be presented to them for their comment before promulgation. There was no discussion, although the qualification by Admiral Pownall that in certain circumstances this might not be possible must have been somewhat galling.

On Guam more than 20,000 people have lived under the United States flag for almost half a century. They are still second-class citizens, with only an advisory voice in their affairs, ruled by laws that are what the Navy Governor or the Navy Department says they are. Navy Government of Guam has been, on the whole, benign, contrary to some exaggerated reports. Most Navy Governors have been conscientious men. Some of them, such as Admiral Pownall, have been deeply interested in the welfare of the Guamanians. But it still has been government without the consent of the governed, taxation without representation and a violation of fundamental democratic principles.

The Guamanians have been governed largely for the benefit of the United States, in order to make the most efficient use of Guam as a forward military base. That is the situation today. The military comes first in everything. Guam is now one of our most important naval bases in the Pacific. It is all the more important that the United States should practice there the democracy it preaches. Congress would do well to grant citizenship to the Guamanians and give to the Eighth Congress of Guam the right of local self-government to which the Guamanians are entitled and for which we believe they would prove their competence.

INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF SENATE BILL 1024

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 1024, to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd, introduced by me on April 2, 1947, and that it be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be indefinitely postponed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KILGORE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a National Defense Establishment, which shall be administered by a Secretary of National

Defense, and for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Force within the National Defense Establishment, and for the coordination of the activities of the National Defense Establishment with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF REPORT BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ENTITLED "TERMINATION OF WAR CONTROLS" (S. DOC. NO. 42)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on January 8, 1947, I presented to the Senate a report entitled "Termination of War Controls."

At that time, I received permission from the Senate to print, as a Senate document, a report setting forth the provisions of Federal statutes affected by the termination of hostilities, the war, or the emergency.

This latter information relating to the termination of war controls was subsequently printed as Senate Document No. 5.

Today, I received a report prepared by the Department of Justice on provisions of Federal statutes affected by the termination of hostilities, the war, or emergency.

This study by the Department of Justice is based on Senate Document No. 5.

The information outlined in the report of the Department of Justice has a definite historical value and, aside from that, will undoubtedly serve as a very effective working tool for the Senate and for the House in connection with the consideration of wartime controls.

The data were also submitted to the House Committee on the Judiciary in response to an informal request by Representatives MICHENER and SPRINGER.

The report, apparently, represents the views of the various interested agencies.

At a later date the Senate Judiciary Committee will, in all probability, prepare its own report which will deal with the same items but will present the conclusions of the committee rather than the conclusions of the various agencies involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed, as a Senate document, the report prepared by the Department of Justice, which I send to the desk at this time, and I request that my remarks be incorporated therein.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE HERBERT HOOVER

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a few days ago a group representing various shades of political opinions and social points of view sent to the Honorable Herbert Hoover a tribute in appreciation of the wonderful service he has recently rendered at the invitation of the President of the United States in making a survey of food conditions in Germany. I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks there be inserted in the RECORD the letter addressed to Mr.

Hoover, together with the names of the signers, representing an important cross section of American citizens.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable HERBERT HOOVER,
The Waldorf-Astoria, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: Representing various shades of political opinions and social points of view, we ask you to accept our profoundest gratitude for the latest proof you have given of your unselfish and patriotic readiness to serve your country and humanity at all times. At an age when most men are thinking only of rest and freedom from responsibilities, you immediately responded to President Truman's call and went overseas, in the face of the worst winter weather known abroad in decades, to report upon the German situation and what must be done by our Government to make that conquered country able to maintain itself.

This you did in an amazingly short time, in a brief but compact and convincing study which could hardly be equalled by any other American since no other citizen has had so extensive an experience in dealing with foreign food and economic conditions as you. Your report is also a model in the complete detachment with which you wrote it, your refusal to yield to hate or bitterness, or even to dwell upon the sins of those whose plight you studied in order to protect yourself from the charge of showing undue favoritism to the nation which plunged the world into its present desperate and desperately alarming misery.

Instead, you stressed the indubitable fact that if western civilization is to survive in Europe, it must survive in Germany. You have brought out that its people have "sunk in food, warmth, and shelter" to the lowest level known in a hundred years, and that their being made into a cooperative member of western civilization is the hope of lasting peace. Then, in the finest historic American spirit of benevolence and justice, you ended with these words: "After all, our flag flies over these people. That flag means something besides military power." Nothing else that has been said gives a similar expectation that our experiment in controlling a European nation will in the end be worthy of our country and its ideals.

In your entire career you have shown your realization that the greatest glory of the American flag has been its humanitarian leadership wherever need existed. Your vision has never been restricted to the confines of the American hemisphere, or to those whose ideals were ours—witness your magnificent aid to starving Russia after the First World War. But this is only one way in which you have set a most admirable example to our Nation. It has been recently said of you that you have been personifying the conscience of America in international affairs. We are happy to approve this characterization, to express to you again our sincerest gratitude for the enlightened service with which you are rounding out your years of patriotic devotion, and to assure you that it will never be forgotten.

Sincerely and cordially yours,

Charles C. Burlingham, Peter Grimm,
George McAneny, Eugene Meyer,
Oswald Garrison Villard, Dorothy Thompson, Henry R. Luce, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Philip D. Reed, Winthrop W. Aldrich, Anne O'Hare McCormick, Lucius M. Boomer, Adolf A. Berle, Jr., John Haynes Holmes, Shepard Morgan, Frank D. Fackenthal, James T. Shotwell, Harry Emerson Fosdick, Nicholas Murray Butler, Roger N. Baldwin, Harry Woodburn Chase, Walter Damrosch, Norman Thomas, George N. Shuster, Ray Morris,

Felix Morley, Walter Rosen, Christopher Emmet, Jr., George J. Gillespie, James Marshall, Charles F. Darlington, George A. Buttrick, Oswald W. Knauth, Allen Dulles, Clare Boothe Luce, George Roosevelt, Eustace Seligman, Arthur Dean, Francis T. P. Plimpton, Jeremiah Milbank, William M. Chadbourne, Adriaan J. Barnouw, Carl Ackerman, Frederick G. Clark, William J. Donovan, Horace M. Albright, Vincent Sheean, Thomas J. Watson.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Federal Aid for Education," delivered by him at Teachers College, Columbia University, April 7, 1947, under sponsorship of Phi Delta Kappa, which appears in the Appendix.]

ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITION FOR DESIGN FOR FEDERAL MEMORIAL TO THOMAS JEFFERSON—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of March 30, 1947, announcing an architectural competition for a design for a Federal memorial to Thomas Jefferson, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

WE MUST CONQUER FEAR—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOEY

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "We Must Conquer Fear," recently issued by him to the press, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROBERT E. LEE, THE AMERICAN—ADDRESS BY FRED P. MYERS

[Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Robert E. Lee, the American," delivered by Fred P. Myers, commander in chief of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, in Statuary Hall, United States Capitol, on the occasion of the celebration of the one hundred and fortieth anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee, which appears in the Appendix.]

POPULAR ELECTION OF PRESIDENT—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials on the subject of popular election of President, one from the Herald-News of Fall River, Mass., and the other from the Gazette, Haverhill, Mass., which appear in the Appendix.]

WAR OR PEACE—EDITORIAL FROM CAMDEN (N. J.) NEWS

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Will It Be War or Peace?" published in the Camden (N. J.) News of March 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

BACK TO THE UNITED NATIONS—ADDRESS BY HENRY A. WALLACE

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Back to the United Nations," delivered by Hon. Henry A. Wallace, editor of the

New Republic, at Madison Square Garden, New York City, March 31, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORLD FEDERATION—ADDRESS BY DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on federal world government by Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, in Asheville, N. C., February 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—EDITORIAL FROM THE LEWISTON (IDAHO) MORNING TRIBUNE

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial relating to proposed assistance to Greece and Turkey, from the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune of March 16, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPLICATIONS OF GRECIAN-TURKISH LOAN PROPOSAL—EDITORIAL FROM STATEWIDE

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Peace—It's Monotonous," from Statewide, of Boise, Idaho, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Baldwin	Hill	O'Daniel
Ball	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Udstead
Eastland	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eaton	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Wherry
Fulbright	Maybank	White
George	Millikin	Wiley
Green	Moore	Williams
Gurney	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young
Hayden	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 18, it is proposed to insert "and (5) by incurring and defraying necessary expenses, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation of personnel, in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this act."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, the President has submitted his message to the joint session of Congress requesting a loan or a gift of \$400,000,000 for the use of Greece and Turkey, to be divided \$250,000,000 for Greece and \$150,000,000 for Turkey. The President based his request upon the statement that this money was needed to combat spreading communism in the Eastern Hemisphere. The UN, or United Nations, was not mentioned in the message nor has any request been made to the United Nations to take part in this problem. Hon. Warren Austin, United States delegate to the United Nations, has just stated that it is the purpose of the administration to notify the United Nations that we expect their assistance if and when we request it. Only now, weeks after the President delivered his message, has any official statement been made to place the United States in the United Nations set-up. It seems to me that the United States should have first applied to the United Nations before embarking upon this unilateral project. It has been said that the United Nations has neither the power nor the available money to act positively. Nevertheless, the United Nations was set up for this particular purpose, and apparently the administration is bypassing the United Nations in this unilateral proposal by the President. It would have created a better feeling both in this country and in the United Nations had the President applied to them to take part in this action.

Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, testifying before a congressional committee, recently asserted:

I wish to reiterate that the United States in undertaking aid to Greece and Turkey is not assuming British obligations or underwriting British policy there or elsewhere.

In spite of Dean Acheson's statement that the United States is not undertaking aid to Greece and Turkey and is not assuming British obligations, we have the President's own statement:

No other nation except the United States is willing and able to provide the necessary support for a democratic Greek government.

The British Government, which has been helping Greece, can give no financial or economic aid after March 31. Great Britain finds itself under the necessity of reducing and liquidating its commitments in several parts of the world, including Greece. The British Government has informed us that

owing to its own difficulties it can no longer give financial or economic aid to Turkey.

As in the case of Greece, if Turkey is to have the assistance it needs, the United States must supply it.

The American people do not object to aiding starving people either in Greece or Turkey, if they are starving, but the President's message goes far beyond that. Does he not, in effect, place us in the position of inviting every country in the world to make a like request for money from the United States?

It was stated by the Christian Science Monitor on March 20:

Current estimates assume that Congress will disgorge the \$400,000,000 requested for Greece and Turkey, but this will only start the operations on one small sector of the front. It is believed from preliminary estimates that the total cost of waging a counteroffensive against Russian influence by means short of war would run to about \$5,000,000,000 a year.

Obviously we will not be confined to this single request for Greece and Turkey, but will have to underwrite all the European and Asiatic countries, and I doubt if the United States is either able or willing to engage in that sort of program. I fear that our attempt to enter the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey inevitably means another war. Oh, I know there is tremendous pressure being exerted now upon the Congress to approve this move by the President. Our top-flight statesmen have been repeatedly telling us that we must approve. Still if it is the duty of the Senate either to approve or reject this proposal, we must not be rushed into something in which we do not believe. We must not accept the statements of our eminent statesmen simply because they say we must do so.

The President says in his message that we will be obligated to provide the personnel for these two countries. Does not personnel mean soldiers and armament? No other construction can be placed upon his words. No other construction can be placed upon his intent. Undoubtedly the United States is heading once more for a world war, regardless of the protestations of the statesmen who urge us to do what the President requests.

What difference is there in the pattern of this request than the pattern of former President Roosevelt in World War II? Were we not assured over and over again by him that our boys would not be required to take part in another war? The record is full of such protestations and yet in the end we entered the most terrible war in history. Is that to be the outcome of this move into the Mediterranean area? Apparently this has the same pattern as that of World War II.

Our distinguished leader has told us that it is the duty of each individual Senator to examine the facts for himself and then make up his own mind as to what judgment should prevail. I have done exactly that. I have taken the facts as they have been discussed in the hearings and I can arrive at no other conclusion than that it is a serious mistake for the United States to enter this movement into the eastern European area. After examining those facts it appears

to me that only one conclusion can be arrived at by a conscientious Member of Congress, and that is that we should deny the President's request.

If this proposal of the President's is made for the purpose of stopping communism from spreading in Europe, what about communism in the United States? J. Edgar Hoover and other able men have stated publicly that communism has become infiltrated into many walks of life in the United States. On every hand we hear of Communists here at home gradually, but certainly, working into our Government and our industries.

We have been told repeatedly that the President's hands must be upheld for the purpose of helping free people everywhere. Let me remind the President that the Greeks are not a free people; Greece is a monarchy. Nor are the people of Turkey free after the pattern of the United States.

Many have forgotten that the famous Monroe Doctrine, which has become a settled policy of the United States, is a two-way highway applying equally to Europe as to the Western Hemisphere. Europe is notified by that doctrine to keep out of South America. By the same policy the same doctrine applies to Europe. It is a two-way highway, and if we are to insist that Russia and other European countries keep out of South America, it is equally true that we should keep out of Europe. But those who are insisting that the Monroe Doctrine only applies to the Western Hemisphere have apparently forgotten that it applies equally to Europe and Asia.

It is difficult for Senators to understand the necessity for this sudden action on the part of the President. True, we are now told that most of the spade work of drafting the Truman message was done by the State Department financial and economic and political experts, under the chairmanship of Loy O. Henderson, Director of Near Eastern and African Affairs, but is that the real reason for this sudden activity on the part of the administration? One has a right to wonder.

As Frank Waldrop says in the *Times-Herald* on March 16:

Mr. Truman has discovered all of a sudden that the Communists of the world are dangerous people, and so they are.

But why is it the Communists are more dangerous in Greece and Turkey than they are in Washington, D. C.?

Here he comes to Congress and asks approximately half a billion dollars to start an anti-Communist program abroad that says to Russia plain as day, "If you want a war, we're ready."

Yet, right now, today, there are on the pay roll of the taxpayers of the United States Communists who are for Russia first, and have been ever since Mr. Truman came to Washington, a freshman Senator from Missouri.

In fact, they were in Washington long before him. They came here with his predecessor in the Presidency and laughed at Roosevelt as "the Kerensky of our revolution."

They demonstrated their power in the Roosevelt administration right at the start. Who remembers the late Dr. William Wirt, of Gary, Ind.? Dr. Wirt was a distinguished and liberal educator of world renown.

He came to Washington to see what the brand-new deal was like. He didn't come as a pay-roll patriot, but as a plain patriot, wanting to find out what kind of people had risen to power.

What he found out was that the Communists and their fellow travelers had at last, with Roosevelt, got themselves into places of power and importance in our Government. So he gave warning.

Did the newspaper editors and college presidents and Members of Congress and other such opinion makers take him seriously? Well does this writer remember how, for instance, the distinguished Baltimore Sun and New York Times gave out gentlemanly haw-haws at Dr. Wirt and how college presidents the country over followed up the cue. As for Congress, it was just as guilty as Roosevelt in those days, and it deliberately made Dr. Wirt a laughing stock.

He went to his grave a bitter and frustrated man, while the editors of the Baltimore Sun and the New York Times and all such noble-minded heavy thinkers continued to say that we must worry about fascism and nazism abroad, but, as for communism, why, it is not a problem and, besides, to criticize the Communists would be Red-baiting, and who wants to be a Red-baiter?

This proposed aid for Greece and Turkey is a complete change of policy from anything that the United States has ever engaged in. I want to say now categorically that I am opposed to this loan, or gift, by whatever name it is called, and urge Senators to join me in voting against it.

I am not an internationalist, nor am I an isolationist. The Republican Party now believes, and always has believed, in refraining from meddling in the affairs of other countries. I am an American, first, last, and all the time, believing in our form of government and the welfare of America before that of any other people.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, within the next few days the Senate will pass upon the proposed loan or grant to the Greek and Turkish Governments. This will be a critical hour. America will then take a new course.

The world is truly at the crossroads. There is hunger, cold, and sickness in practically every part of the world. The aftermath of war, the most destructive war of all time, and the thought that we may have another war are causes of unrest, uncertainty, and confusion. Unfortunately this applies even to the United States.

For the first time in civilization's history the world is looking to the Western Hemisphere for hope, guidance, and peace.

As a newcomer to the Senate I had fully intended to remain silent during these deliberations. But world conditions and what I have observed on the home front compel me at this time to offer some observations for the consideration of Senators in connection with the discussion of the Greek-Turkish loan.

When the President recently called upon Congress to spend \$400,000,000 to prop up the existing regimes of Greece and Turkey he turned a new page in history for the United States.

It seems to me that in our study and discussion of this proposed loan—or shall I say grant or gift—to Greece and Turkey, we should consider it not as an

isolated plan but as a tile in a large mosaic. If the United States proceeds to take the step requested, it should not do so with blinders on. The Nation should act only after a careful look around the barrel. Before we sign on the dotted line we should lay down firmly and understand clearly the terms and conditions upon which we embrace this new policy. The searchlight of truth should be turned on in full force for the benefit of the American people.

Through much of its history, the United States has been the victim of fuzzy diplomacy. We have never lost a shooting war, but we have won few diplomatic battles. Invariably this has left us out on the end of a limb when we should have been resting comfortably in the shade at the foot of the tree.

If we had been more practical and hard-boiled in demanding adherence to the ideals of our people in 1917, our allies would then have committed themselves for the postwar period. But we waited until the shooting was over. Then they did not need us any more. They were not interested in our wishes, and as a result we found ourselves in the unholy mess of the Versailles Peace Conference.

If during World War II we had been tough-minded enough to lay down conditions for our help and lend-lease, we would not find ourselves in the unholy mess of today at Moscow and generally about the world. We would not have secret conditions, spawned in secret conferences, bobbing up to haunt us. We would not be discovering belatedly that we were promising and giving away everything without proper regard for our own national safety and the peace of the world.

In 1942 and 1943, for instance, we might have settled with the British the troubled and important Palestine issue in which real red-blooded Americans are greatly interested.

Today we face a new situation in which British interests are prime. Are we to jump into this thing blindly as though it had no connection with anything else in the world? Or are we going to consider the collateral aspects before it is too late? I think there is similarity between the troubles faced by the British in Greece and their problems in Palestine. So far as I am concerned, there is no time like the present for being hard-boiled and for having a clear understanding. If we are going to be soft-brained and merely let ourselves be swept along, we are due for another round of regrets and recriminations. I hope we have learned our lesson.

This is a good time for the British to make clear once and for all their attitude on Palestine. It is a good time to let them know that America expects them to comply with their solemn obligations as set forth in the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924. In bringing these matters to the attention of the Senate, I am not unmindful of the fact that the problem has been submitted to the United Nations.

Mr. President, recently I issued a statement on the Palestine situation. I now ask unanimous consent that this

statement be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON PALESTINE ISSUED BY SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Consideration of the British proposal with respect to economic and military aid for Greece inevitably centers attention upon the course they have taken in other lands where downtrodden and oppressed people placed their trust, confidence, and their hope of survival in the pledged word of the British Government.

In view of Great Britain's appeal that the United States assume her commitments in Greece, I cannot resist the opportunity of discussing her policy toward Palestine.

Such discussion does not, in any way, reflect on the merits of the request for our Government's assistance in Greece and Turkey.

I have long been interested in the matter of helping the unfortunate children of Israel who need help so desperately.

During my term as Governor of Pennsylvania I urged that the President and the Secretary of State take a very firm position with our friend, Great Britain. In order to relieve and correct the horrible plight of the persecuted Jews of Europe.

In fact, before the British Foreign Secretary's attack upon our President, I wrote to both President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall urging a firm stand by our Government toward the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews who, through no fault of their own, find themselves in displaced persons camps of Europe.

To desire for these homeless Jews a peaceful haven in the Holy Land is not partisan; it is not political—it is humane, it is a legal and spiritual obligation of both America and Great Britain.

Both the Republican and Democratic Parties made solemn pledges in their 1944 party platforms.

The Republicans spoke in these words: "In order to give refuge to millions of distressed Jewish men, women, and children driven from their homes by tyranny, we call for the opening of Palestine to their unrestricted immigration and land ownership, so that in accordance with the full intent and purpose of the Balfour Declaration of 1917 and the resolution of a Republican Congress in 1922, Palestine may be constituted as a free and democratic commonwealth." The Democratic platform used the following language: "We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

The time has come to stop giving these unfortunate men, women, and children mere lip service. The time has come to stop sending greetings on the occasions of their high holidays, but rather to supplant them with such action that may prove more beneficial.

The time has come for our Government to treat the British attitude toward Palestine not only as a diplomatic and humanitarian matter, but also as a legal matter. Under the Anglo-American Treaty of 1924 and subsequent arrangements, the United States has a right and a duty to insist that the international obligations assumed by Great Britain be no longer disregarded by the British Government.

Our general friendliness with Great Britain should not deter us from protesting illegal conduct by our friends across the ocean. We certainly have had no hesitancy in protesting against other nations. Injustice is injustice by whomever committed and nothing but good can result in the long run if our Government takes a firm stand.

In Europe today, in camps for displaced persons, and wandering the highways of a

torn continent are a few hundred thousand homeless Jews—all that are left after the awful sin against their people by Hitler and his Nazi hordes.

For them, in a very real and not merely in a symbolic sense, Palestine is the end of the road for the wandering Jew. It is a place they can call home. It is their last hope on earth.

Yet—and this is such a bitter mockery—Britain permits only a trickle of immigration into the Holy Land.

Under the mandate, Britain must facilitate Jewish immigration and settlement. If Britain desires to ask the United Nations to change the terms of the trust which she is supposed to execute, well and good; but until this has been done, Britain has a legal obligation to continue fulfilling that trust.

The immigration of 1,500 persons a month is not fulfillment. It is one more brutal jest against a people whose sufferings in the past decade have been without parallel in modern history.

There is a doctrine of law common to England and to this country—that anyone who seeks equitable relief from a burden alleged to be too heavy must come into court with clean hands. I think we have a right to expect clean hands from Britain before she submits her request regarding Palestine to the United Nations. We have a right to expect this—not coarse attacks by the British Foreign Secretary.

It is intolerable that the immediate movement into Palestine of the first 100,000 Jewish refugees at a speedy rate should be dangled as bait and made conditional upon everybody else accepting British ideas of future policy. After all, a mandate over a country is not a fee simple title to that land and its people.

This movement of the 100,000 should start at once. Neither the Government of the United States nor the United Nations as a whole should agree to entertain the British request to study the long-range Palestine problem until the United Kingdom has shown that much evidence of good faith.

In view of Mr. Bevin's statement, I feel that Congress has a definite right and duty to demand that provisions of the mandate be taken from the shelf and brought to life. We have a right and duty to demand also application of the portions of the mandate which deal with equal rights for inhabitants of Palestine.

The mandate and the Anglo-American Treaty direct the British government to facilitate Jewish settlement on the land in Palestine. They provide also that no discrimination should be shown among the inhabitants of the country by reason of race or religion. Actually, however, Jews are being prohibited by regulation from settling and acquiring land in most of Palestine.

In this respect, Britain brazenly violates the elementary civil rights of the Jewish population of Palestine.

This is being done in a country upon which the Jews have special claims—only one of which is international law. It is being done by a socialistic government supposed to be particularly sensitive to human rights.

Aside from every other reason which has been mentioned, I insist there is a special reason why all Christian people should extend a helping hand to the unfortunate Jews of Europe.

It is from the loins of that ancient race that our own faith has sprung. They are a part of the basic history of Christianity and, indeed, have become our historic responsibility.

We owe it to ourselves as well as to them to meet this responsibility by firmly and fearlessly declaring to the British Government that America expects the fulfillment of this legal and moral obligation.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Palestine issue illustrates one of the two

points I wish to make—that this country's policy makers have a habit of swan-diving into the pool without first looking to see whether there is any water there. This is an important collateral issue. It is likewise an issue on which we have long had Britain's promise, but never Britain's fulfillment.

The second point is that the policy makers take the American people with them blindfolded. Our leaders fail to disclose all the facts.

The proposed \$400,000,000 expenditure has been frankly described as a barrier of gold to keep communism out and to permit free governments an honest opportunity to grow and spread.

I am not opposing this loan—or gift—to Greece and Turkey. I, too, have a desire to keep communism out and to water the roots of free government abroad, because that helps free government at home. But, I would like to know that it is free government that we are helping, government which respects the dignity of the individual man and which does not seek to subjugate him under an autocratic state. To bolster and prop up tottering governments which oppress the great masses of their people and deny minorities their rights is not in keeping with American ideals. This is something we should settle now—not later, when they do not need us any more.

But, Mr. President, it will take a vast amount of gold to build that high wall against communism. I wonder if any Member of the United States Senate, or anyone in President Truman's administration, can say how high and how long the wall must be. From such information as I have been able to gather, the \$400,000,000 is only the beginning. Shortly after the President's address to Congress, the Acting Secretary of State announced that an additional \$600,000,000 would be required for Korea.

If those were the only requests to be made, perhaps I would not be so deeply concerned, but only recently I was advised by a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the over-all program for aid and development of foreign nations will represent an investment of \$31,885,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. This statement, while shocking to me, was reiterated at great length and in detail in the March 21 issue of the United States News. Yet back of all that, in the shadows, are the yet unvoiced requests for more and more for this place and that place all over the globe.

Mr. President, as I said, I am not opposing the \$400,000,000 expenditure. But first I should like to have some idea of how much we may be called upon to vote during the next 2 or the next 4 years. I do not want to be told 6 months from now, "You helped get us into this thing with your vote for the \$400,000,000. We are now in it up to our necks and it is up to you to sign a blank check for funds to finish the job." It seems to me that we should not be called upon to legislate on any such basis.

Not only the Senate of the United States but, even more important, all the people of the United States have a right to all available information on this matter. Our folks back home are the ones who must carry the new burden on their

backs, loaded atop the present \$258,000,000,000 national debt. They have a right to know what is at the end of the road for them if they say "No." They also have a right to know what is at the end of the road if they provide the \$400,000,000 and then stop. Finally, they have a right to know what awaits them if they give the green light for full speed ahead.

I admit that all the answers are not known, but the best available information should be given.

We all have a right to know just how much burden the United States as a whole can bear.

Before we can answer this question we must make a survey and inventory of our financial condition, and we must determine whether we are willing to make the necessary sacrifices.

It is a time when the global picture should be revealed.

Let us know of all our commitments, wherever made.

What financial commitments have been made in Europe and the Far East?

What expenditures are already made, and what additional commitments are contemplated?

How long shall we continue relief in Greece, Turkey, and the other countries of Europe and the Far East?

What personnel, civilian, and military, is contemplated to administer and carry out the policies adopted or to be adopted?

What estimate has been made of the cost of rehabilitation of Germany and Japan?

We must know all these things, because governments can go broke the same as can individuals.

In very recent days we have had a grim graphic demonstration that there is a bottom to the pocketbook of even the richest nations. We have learned that wealthy world empires can suddenly find themselves poor.

During the lifetime of all of us it was the proud boast of a great people that the sun never sets on the British flag. Britain was the great world empire. It was the balance of power. From the ends of the earth—from the tropics, from the temperate zones, and from the frozen polar areas—wealth funneled to Britain. In exchange this empire worked and spent ceaselessly to maintain stability and balance around the globe. Many figured all this would last forever.

But in the month of March 1947—last month—Britain sighed and laid down her burden, announcing to the world, "It is too heavy; we cannot go on."

Mr. President, Britain, which during our lifetime was the richest and most powerful country on earth, had filed what amounted to a voluntary petition in bankruptcy.

As I see it, from their experience should come the warning and the proof that it can happen here, as well.

The people of the United States and the Congress of the United States should be told the facts. They should be advised that they cannot burn the candle at both ends, or we shall find ourselves tomorrow where Britain finds itself today.

Our people must learn that there is a bottom even to the American pocket. I

hope we shall not have to learn it the hard way, as the British did.

Our people must be told without equivocation and without deceit that if they spend abroad, they must pinch at home. I understand I am saying things that many people do not like to hear. Perhaps many will resent my saying these things. However, I am not engaged in a popularity contest. I am after facts. I am gravely concerned, just as all other Senators are, about the future of America.

Our people must be made to understand that if we build that barrier of gold in Greece and Turkey and Korea and elsewhere, we cannot spend the same money twice; we cannot use it to buy comforts and luxuries for our homes.

Our people must realize that they cannot expect new and expanded services from Washington.

Our people must be made to understand that it will be necessary to cut, and cut sharply, into Federal services which have been built up in the past 15 years. They must be told now that sacrifices will be in order on the home front.

They must learn that local communities, counties, and State governments must assume a greater share of the responsibilities, and that many of the services which they expect from Uncle Sam must be furnished at the local levels.

Let me point out that it makes no difference how strong financially each of the 48 States remains; if we undermine and destroy the financial structure of the Federal Government, each and every one of them will be caught in the backwash and will be destroyed.

I notice with surprise that many of the same persons who are foremost in the fight to save Greece and the other countries from communistic domination are also foremost in calling for maintenance of all existing Federal services and for the adoption of new ones. That is the kind of thing which will pitch our ship of state high on the jagged rocks of financial disaster.

This statement would seem to be a direct thrust at the present Democratic administration, for certainly the shoe fits there, and fits perfectly. But I do not mean it as such. I have no intention of belaboring the obvious. I am speaking of people outside of government and outside of Washington—the folks back home in the districts.

Some of them, for instance, are placing considerable pressure upon Congress for elaborate new educational assistance for the States. We are being asked for a new appropriation for this purpose. But that is only a starter. I have been advised it is merely the first step, the first request. I have been told that after this beachhead is established an even larger sum will be asked next year, and the year after, and so on.

I say that our people should be informed honestly and completely that if we give or lend this \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey—which apparently will commit us to greater sums as required—they cannot expect additional educational benefits from the Federal Government, because the cupboard may be bare.

It has been estimated that the GI bill of rights and other benefits already

voted for our veterans will eventually cost the country \$30,000,000,000 or more. But if we check on the bills already introduced this session to help veterans—and there are plenty more to come—we find that additional billions would be required. America cannot do too much for its disabled veterans and the dependents of those who made the supreme sacrifice, but our veterans and taxpayers should be given a very clear picture of what this contemplated new plunge will mean to them.

And so it goes down the list for the various requests that have been made.

During the New Deal era, our Government blossomed out on all sides with new tinsel and services. They have appeared in every department. Entirely new agencies have sprung up. Each of them cost money. In the aggregate they cost billions.

Somebody has got to step up and say to our people: "If we go into this thing, you will get no new services or new benefits from the Government. In fact, if we go into this, we will be compelled to cut out some of the things to which you have already become accustomed."

Otherwise we will head down the road taken by Britain. We will spend more than we can afford. We will seek to keep alive and vigorous by drinking our own blood for nourishment. For us, the question will cease to be: "Will excessive Federal spending break us?" Instead, it will become, merely, "How soon?"

Mr. President, I said a few moments ago that there may be much merit in propping up Greece and Turkey at this time. That is not the question on which we seek the pros and cons. What we want all the facts about—for and against—are these questions:

What is the bill going to involve—not merely for the first treatment, but for the entire course of treatments?

How much of our household budget money must we sacrifice for this course of treatments?

And what is the alternative if we do not sign up for the course?

Even if no one has all the answers, I call for a public airing of those which are available. We should have answers, not only from Members of the Senate, but also from the persons in the administration who know the most about the situation.

If we are to be an influence for good in the world, we must remain strong. We cannot help others if we destroy ourselves.

Mr. President, I do not favor isolationism and I am not opposing the proposed expenditures, but I make these observations because I do know there must be a strong, solvent, dynamic America if we are to bring happiness to the peoples of the world, as well as to our own folks at home.

Mr. President, I know that all the Members of this body, as well as all the people of America, were greatly impressed by the magnificent address which you, as the head of the great Foreign Relations Committee, delivered in the Senate yesterday. But what I am now urging is that all people in America shall understand the situation which now confronts us. We cannot spend

the money for two different things, one for foreign aid and the other for domestic improvements. We must keep America dynamic and solvent. We must get back to the old ideals of thrift, prudence, hard work, and love of God, which made this the greatest Nation on the earth. It is the only beacon of hope in the whole world, it is the only instrumentality which can protect us and the rest of the world from chaos, disorder, and probably disaster.

Again I say, Mr. President, that I am not opposing this loan, but I am hoping and praying that this body, the House of Representatives, the members of the executive departments, and all the people of the United States may seriously consider the situation now approaching in America and its meaning to America's future.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator in his address, which is most thought provoking, and manifests great sincerity, brought out one point which I should like to emphasize. As he presented the subject, he spoke of the need for thrift, prudence, and economy, stated that our national economy is threatened, and adverted to the large sums being paid our veterans through legislation enacted by the Congress in the aftermath of the war. That was a part of the evidence he adduced.

I point out that the eminent statesman Briand, of France, made a trenchant statement some years ago to the effect that in modern warfare no nation wins. During the recent war the United States was spending \$8,000,000,000-plus every 30 days to carry on the war, and \$100,000,000,000-plus every year. All that money is destroyed capital, destroyed forever. Our boys went overseas and won the war, if any nation ever can be said to win a war. Now they are back in the United States. Certainly I do not think for a moment the Senator from Pennsylvania wishes his speech to be construed as meaning that there is any lack of understanding on our part as citizens and Members of Congress that whatever is required to rehabilitate shattered lives and to reinstall the servicemen in civilian life should be provided, insofar as the Members of Congress can see that it is provided. Does not the Senator from Pennsylvania agree?

Mr. MARTIN. Absolutely.

Mr. TOBEY. Perhaps I got the wrong impression, but in calling the roll of the items the Senator brought in the veterans' matter, and I did not want to let that go unchallenged, because I did not think for a moment the distinguished Senator had any lack of sympathy for the veterans. Merely to clarify the Record, I mention the point.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the Senator very much. There is no Member of the Senate who is more enthusiastic about making contributions for the benefit of the disabled veteran, or taking care of the dependents of those who made the supreme sacrifice, than am I, and I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator and I both appreciate, as I am sure our colleagues

do, that the cataclysmic effect of the hell we call war is now coming home to us as never before. We realize that when we go into war, when we open the door to war, God only knows what the end will be. The repercussions will continue from generation to generation. Yet, on the horizon still is the danger of a third world war. I agree with the Senator that God only knows what is ahead of us, so we must live day by day as best we can, and always with a sense of our responsibility to those who bore the heat of the battle.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee, which has been stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is it the intention of the majority leader that the Senate proceed with the bill at this time?

Mr. WHITE. A number of Senators have indicated a desire to speak upon the bill, and, so far as I know, no one of them is prepared to go forward at this time. I think that means that we must either proceed to vote—and I take it there might be more or less serious objection to that—or to stand in recess until 5 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest to the able majority leader that we might continue with the committee amendments, and adopt them.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I see no reason why we should not complete at least the committee amendments today. I have no disposition to hurry any Senator into a premature decision in respect to the bill, but it is acknowledged that we are not entirely free agents in respect to the time we can spend on it. I know there are a number of speeches to be made which are not ready today, but I should hope we might complete the committee amendments, and I am wondering whether some of the individual amendments could not be presented today, such as those which may be submitted by my able friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who has just risen.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not quite ready to present my amendments. I have five of them, and they will be presented with a full explanation. Of course, I should be very glad to see the committee amendments out of the way, so that the track would be cleared for my amendments. However, if we are going to do any work on the committee amendments, or anything else, or take any action pertaining to this bill, I think we ought to have a quorum call, so that the Members may be advised that we were taking action.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will yield further, of course, I have no objection to a quorum call, and I realize

that Senators have not been on notice that we probably would be down to actual work on the bill today. If we can complete the committee amendments today, so far as I am concerned I should be willing that it go over until tomorrow, but I should certainly like to have it understood that commencing tomorrow we may devote continuous, full-time attention to the bill until it is out of the way. So, I suggest that we proceed with the committee amendments. I think there is no controversy respecting them, and I doubt whether even a quorum call is necessary for that purpose.

Mr. WHITE. I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Michigan. The amendments have all received full consideration at the hands of the committee. They come with the unanimous approval of the committee of which the distinguished Senator from Michigan is chairman. I think we might very appropriately proceed with the committee amendments, and that, at the conclusion, unless there are Members who desire to discuss the bill further, a recess be taken until, say, a quarter to 5.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the only difficulty I see is that it seems to me the committee amendments raise some of the principal questions involved in the whole debate. I wonder whether if the debate were to be continued it ought not to be continued also at least on the two amendments on pages 7 and 8.

Mr. WHITE. Would it be agreeable to the chairman of the committee that we proceed with unobjected-to committee amendments?

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection to the amendments. It merely seemed to me they were such an intrinsic part of any further debate that it might be questionable to foreclose ideas that may arise as the debate goes on, as to possible modification of the amendments. If they are adopted now, they cannot be amended again; they could not be exchanged in any manner except by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHITE. They could be passed over now, if any Senator desired.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senate is going to pass over any of them, we might as well pass them all over and do nothing today, because there are only two or three amendments. It had not occurred to me that the amendments involve any points inherent in the amendments themselves upon which there can be any dissent. If the Senator from Ohio objects to proceeding, I certainly shall not insist, but I shall have to submit to him with great candor that I am not impressed by the point he makes.

Mr. TAFT. I withdraw the objection, Mr. President. There are very few Senators present, and I would think the amendments involved rather important points.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no disposition to press, Mr. President. May we do this? I should like to get the amendment on page 7 in the final form which the committee desires to place it. May we at least do that? That means the amendment which I have submitted to section 2 of the amendment, at the bottom of page 7. May I suggest that that

be submitted to the Senate, so that then the bill is at least in the form which the Committee on Foreign Relations intended to have it presented. I ask that the amendment, which I have offered, at the bottom of page 7, be submitted.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Michigan? Hearing none, the clerk will state the committee amendment.

THE CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 15, it is proposed to insert:

The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:

(1) If requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey, respectively, representing a majority of the people of either such nation;

(2) If the President is officially notified by the United Nations that the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of the veto) or that the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable; and

(3) If the President finds that any purposes of the act have been substantially accomplished by the action of any other intergovernmental organizations or finds that the purposes of the act are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. To the committee amendment the Senator from Michigan offers an amendment, which the clerk will state.

THE CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 7, line 21, it is proposed to strike out the words "the President is officially notified by the United Nations that"; and on page 7, line 24, to strike out the word "that", so that paragraph (2) of section 5 of the committee amendment will read: "If the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of the veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable; and."

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment, is agreed to.

MR. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in view of the action taken on the amendment to the amendment and the statements that have been made by other Senators, I really do not see how we can proceed further this afternoon, although I deeply regret any delay in the consideration of the bill. I should like to say again that I think we should be prepared to proceed from tomorrow noon with unbroken continuity until this matter is concluded.

NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

MR. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to take 5 minutes of the Senate's time. From all available evidence, this great legislative body is all set to act in a way which will reflect little credit on itself as a body or on its Members as individuals.

It has been agreed that at 5 o'clock the Senate shall vote on the nomination of David Lilienthal to the most important appointive office with which we have

ever been concerned. The test vote of last week gives a definite indication that unless something extraordinary takes place, the nomination will be confirmed. Mr. President, I make an earnest plea for an extraordinary action between now and the time set for voting.

Let me again call the attention of my fellow Senators to the astonishing proposal which has been made to us. The committee to which this nomination was referred held hearings for many weeks. In the course of its hearings and at an early stage charges of dishonesty were made against the candidate. These charges were specific, not general. They were made by Dr. Arthur Morgan, a man of honor and of good repute. Yet these charges were never followed up by the committee. They were dismissed; they were dropped; they were ignored. I doubt if it would be possible to find a comparable situation in any committee in any recent Congress. One would expect that there would have been at least an endeavor to brush a thin coat of whitewash over the incident, but even this was not done.

What seems to have happened, Mr. President, is that the committee was hypnotized into a failure of performing its plain and obvious duty. It was hypnotized by great names in engineering, business, and science, a handful of whom had themselves been hypnotized by the undeniable abilities and the persuasive words of the candidate. These few and eminent men judged him, so far as his character is concerned, on casual acquaintance and on his words rather than his deeds. The opinions thus formed were transmitted to their peers in the fields of engineering, business, and science. The whole effective force of this authoritative opinion was focused on the committee. It deluded them. It blinded them. It persuaded them to neglect their duty to this body and to the Nation.

Mr. President, Dr. Morgan's specific charges of dishonesty against David Lilienthal are too serious to be treated this way. Let me earnestly entreat the members of the committee for their own sakes, for the sake of the faithful discharge of the duties committed to them, to ask that David Lilienthal's name be withdrawn from this action for confirmation and referred back to the committee to see whether it can be cleared of the serious charges against it before we are again asked to vote upon it in this place.

I do not see how the members of this committee, I do not see how the Members of the Senate, can clear themselves with their own consciences in the performance of the duties to which they have solemnly sworn to devote themselves until this nomination has been reconsidered.

JURISDICTIONAL STRIKE AT BELLEVILLE, ILL.

MR. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that apparently a number of Senators are not ready to speak upon the Greek-Turkish loan, I want to take a little of the time of the Senate to discuss the very serious jurisdictional strike which is now under way in the State of Illinois. The strike has been going on

for a number of weeks, and the longer it continues the more difficult it seems for the two crafts in the union to adjust or settle their differences.

The way I came into this dispute was through a letter dated February 3, 1947, addressed to me by the Griesedieck Western Brewery Co., of Belleville, Ill. In order that I may do justice to the statement I am making, I shall take the time of the Senate to read this letter into the RECORD:

HON. SCOTT LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUCAS: We have had a jurisdictional dispute for the past 3 weeks at our new bottling plant, and it is most unfair to us. Furthermore, it is beginning to cost us several thousand dollars. In view of pending congressional legislation, it occurs to me that if you had a thumb-nail description of this controversy, that you could settle this matter easily. We respectfully request that you use your good offices in helping to expedite the settlement of this dispute.

The dispute is jurisdictional over the installation of bottling machinery in our new bottling-plant building. The past 15 years we have had a contract with the machinists' organization who do all our maintenance work, and their contract covers the erection of all metal machinery. The millwrights, who are a member of the Brotherhood of Journeymen, Carpenters, and Joiners, also claim this work. The millwrights' claim is based on the fact that this work was awarded to them by the building-trades department of the American Federation of Labor, of which the machinists are not a member. We have made every endeavor to bring the two organizations together, and have even gone as far as agreeing to let both crafts do the work at the same time. In this day and age, neither one of the organizations are interested in this. They are more interested in setting a precedent in the Belleville area as to who installs new machinery. The consequence of the dispute has stopped all work in our new plant. If the machinists do the work, then the building trades will picket our plant, and no tradesman, of course, would work. If the millwrights do the work, our brewery workers and bottlers will not work.

In view of your liberal views toward labor and management, it occurs to me that a word from you to the following two men would carry a lot of weight, and, no doubt, will settle this matter. We would appreciate it very much if you would telegraph or write the following: Mr. Harvey Brown, president, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.; Mr. William Hutchinson, president, Brotherhood of Journeymen, Carpenters, and Joiners, Indianapolis, Ind.

Regarding Griesedieck Western Brewery Co., of Belleville, Ill., jurisdictional dispute over the erection of bottling machinery. I suggest that you endeavor to compromise this matter and settle it as soon as possible.

That letter appealed to me because of its fairness and its sense of wanting to do the right thing. I therefore took it upon myself to write the two gentlemen named in the letter, Mr. William Hutchinson, president of the Brotherhood of Journeymen Carpenters and Joiners, Indianapolis, Ind., and Mr. Harvey Brown, president of the International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C. The letters are identical. I read one of them into the RECORD:

DEAR MR. HUTCHINSON: It has come to my attention that there is a jurisdictional dispute over the erection of bottling machinery

in the Griesedieck Western Brewery Co., of Belleville, Ill. I am advised that this dispute is one of long standing.

Is there not some way you can compromise this matter as soon as possible? I do not hesitate to say that the matter of jurisdictional disputes is one of the things that Congress will probably outlaw when new labor legislation is written.

Trusting something will be done that will be constructive for both management and labor in this Belleville problem, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

SCOTT W. LUCAS.

This letter was written on March 17. Mr. Hutchinson has never replied to my letter. A similar letter was addressed to Mr. Brown, and a reply was received from him, which is as follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1947.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have before me your communication addressed the writer February 17, and I am pleased to learn of your interest in the dispute over the erection of bottling machinery in the Griesedieck Western Brewery Co., of Belleville, Ill.

Be advised that a convention of the American Federation of Labor, by unanimous vote, declared as follows:

"The International Association of Machinists has jurisdiction over the building, assembling, erecting, dismantling, and repairing of machinery in machine shops, buildings, factories, or elsewhere where machinery may be used."

"The United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners is fundamentally a craft composed of men skilled in the erecting, forming, and assembling of wood materials, and has never been recognized as a metal-craft organization or granted jurisdiction over the making, repairing, erecting, assembling, or dismantling of machinery."

"Resolved, That the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners be, and is hereby, instructed to discontinue the infringement complained of."

Note that that was a resolution which was passed by the American Federation of Labor in its annual convention in Miami, Fla., in February last. Yet notwithstanding that resolution instructing the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners to desist from the infringement upon the other craft organization, which claims, and apparently should have the right to make this construction for the Griesedieck Brewery Co., nevertheless the strike in that community still continues.

On February 22 Mr. Jones, the president of this company, wrote me another letter, in which he stated:

The jurisdictional controversy that we have had between the machinists and the millwrights has not been settled. As a matter of fact, we received an ultimatum from the representatives of both unions that they would not adjust their differences or divide the work, and that each craft demanded all the work or none.

In other words, the president of the company was willing to permit a division of the work so far as these two crafts were concerned, but neither would yield to the division of the work, both claiming that they had the sole right to do the same.

On March 18, 1947, Mr. Jones again wrote to me. His letter is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: Enclosed find a clipping from our local newspaper which pretty well states the jurisdictional controversy

that we are encountering between the machinists and millwrights.

We respectfully request that you use your good offices to bring about legislation that will outlaw jurisdictional disputes.

The next sentence is very important:

We have a new building costing in the neighborhood of \$500,000, and we are unable to use it. Our machinery has been moved into the building, but we cannot set it or erect it. Consequently, many people are standing idly by waiting for this machinery to start running.

If we had this new plant running, we could employ more people, pay more excise taxes, and begin to get a return on our investment. As it now stands, everyone is losing by this work stoppage. Both crafts have threatened us with overwhelming picket lines, and with this established, our own workers would not cross the picket line; subsequently, it would stop our entire production.

There are two things that we would appreciate your doing for us.

First, if you can, prevail upon the following gentlemen to share the work, or in other words, let both crafts divide the work: Mr. William Hutchinson, president, Brotherhood of Journeymen, Carpenters, and Joiners, Indianapolis, Ind.; Mr. Harvey Brown, president, International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

Second, cooperate with Senator TART in giving us Federal legislation immediately against jurisdictional strikes, mass picketing, and union strike violence.

Won't you please give us and our 400 employees relief from this jurisdictional dispute?

Here are 400 employees who want to work every day. Here are individuals who have a large investment in the business, and because of this outrageous jurisdictional strike arising from a dispute between the millwrights on the one hand and the machinists on the other, there is an impasse on the labor front which is causing distress in that community from every conceivable angle.

Mr. President, I did not write Mr. Hutchinson another letter, as requested by Mr. Jones, because he ignored my previous letter in which I asked him if something could not be done to adjust this dispute between the two crafts.

I bring this subject to the attention of the Senate to show what is going on in one section of the country with respect to these outrageous jurisdictional strikes.

In that connection, this morning I received a letter from a gentleman living in Belleville, Ill. He sent me another clipping about the brewery dispute which has been in progress for so long. He writes as follows:

This jurisdictional racket consists of which craft is to erect equipment in the new bottle shop which has been completed some three months past.

I ask you to use your influence to have these union representatives share this work or have some legislation that will definitely eliminate work stoppage in event of jurisdictional arguments.

As a contractor for buildings and heavy construction for the last 30 years, it has been my experience that all craft unions are becoming more and more aggressive to grab something from one another with no regard for the builders, owners, or public rights. It is my belief that unless something is done to correct this evil practice the public and the building construction industry might just as well cease operations until such time as conditions warrant new construction.

There is another quotation which I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate. It is in a letter written by one of the gentlemen whom I have mentioned. He says:

Again referring to the shop at Belleville, Ill., if members of the machinists' union would pay tribute to the carpenters' union for the privilege of working at the machinists' trade there would be no dispute.

Mr. President, is this the real reason for this dispute? Are we to infer that if the carpenters' union was paid money as a tribute, work would proceed. In other words, if the machinists were to pay cash "on the barrelhead" they might be able to proceed with the work. That is apparently what this man is suggesting.

Mr. President, I hope that this jurisdictional strike in my State will be settled. It is inconceivable that such an impasse between different crafts in the same labor organization should occur. It is a shameful episode which has no justification in a free society. Such useless disagreements are giving the cause of labor a serious set-back in America. That such jurisdictional strikes will be outlawed soon is a certainty. In the meantime I call upon William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, to use his good offices to settle and adjust this violent dispute. I do this not only in view of the resolution which was adopted at the convention held in Miami, Fla., of which Mr. Green was chairman, but because of the power Mr. Green wields as president of the AFL. Mr. Green can settle this strike if he will. It is my conviction that he has the power to do so, and it should be done in the interest of the Griesedieck Western Brewery Co., which is entitled to relief. It should be done in the interest of the laboring men and their families, who are also entitled to relief. The company's investment was made in good faith and should not be further jeopardized by this useless, vicious, and un-American jurisdictional dispute.

In conclusion, I wish to say that when the time comes when labor legislation is before the Senate, the Senator from Illinois will vote to outlaw jurisdictional disputes of this character and all other disputes similar in character such as we have experienced in the United States in the past few years.

CHANGE OF NAME OF BOULDER DAM TO HOOVER DAM

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 45, Calendar No. 52.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator to explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam, reported with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not think there will be any objection, but I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Baldwin	Hill	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hoey	Pepper
Bricker	Holland	Reed
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Saitonstall
Butler	Kem	Smith
Byrd	Kilgore	Sparkman
Cain	Knowland	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lodge	Taylor
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cooper	McClellan	Thye
Cordon	McFarland	Tobey
Donnell	McGrath	Tydings
Downey	McKellar	Umstead
Dworschak	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Eaton	Martin	Wherry
Flanders	Maybank	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Wiley
George	Moore	Williams
Green	Morse	Wilson
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hawkes	Myers	
Hayden	O'Connor	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Since the call for a quorum, I have discussed with some Members on this side of the aisle the question raised by the able Senator from New Jersey. It is my understanding that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who is not here at the present time, is very much opposed to the measure which the Senator from New Jersey desires to have considered and will wish to discuss it at some length. Under those circumstances, I should feel constrained to object to the unanimous-consent request, and I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from New Jersey whether he intends to proceed with a motion.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from Nevada is not present and is opposed to the joint resolution, let me say that I knew he was opposed to it, but I did not know he was not present and available this afternoon; and I thought we might utilize the next few hours by considering and passing the joint resolution, which I have been working on for more than a year. However, I do not wish to take unfair advantage of anyone. I wish to play according to Hoyle and according to decent cricket. That being the fact, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request to have the Senate consider the joint resolution at this time, and I make no further motion now under the con-

ditions surrounding the absence of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] be excused from the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of today and tomorrow because of his attendance at the funeral of a close personal friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted the Senator from Nevada.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend, the Senator from New Jersey, that I am very sorry we could not go forward this afternoon with his proposal, because I am anxious to join with him in naming the dam at Boulder Canyon Hoover Dam. I think the services which ex-President Hoover has rendered to the Nation, and particularly his point of view in the field of reclamation and power development in the great western country, more than justify the naming of the dam in his honor.

I understand that there is a little hiatus in the business of the Senate this afternoon, while awaiting the hour of 5 o'clock, and that almost any speech on any subject would be welcome. Mr. President, I have a very dry academic lecture on a very vital problem, namely, industrial safety. I am very glad to take advantage of this particular time, when there is a momentary lull in the conduct of Senate business, to make my speech on the subject of preventing industrial accidents. I do so, not only as a matter of making a record for future reference, but also because I think it is most important that the Senate pay very careful attention to the problem of industrial accidents as we enter upon the consideration of various appropriation bills, particularly those dealing with appropriations which affect the Department of Labor. It is under that Department that the most effective work, insofar as educating the country in regard to industrial accidents, has been done for many years past.

Hence, Mr. President, I shall proceed to place in the Record what I consider to be some very important objective data which Senators should have in mind as we come to pass final judgment on what sums of money should be appropriated to the Department of Labor in order to support its various activities, particularly those in the field of industrial safety education.

Let me say further that later this week, or the first part of next week, I shall introduce a measure dealing with the subject of industrial accidents in the field of mining. I shall also urge the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to proceed as rapidly as possible with the bill which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] introduced some time ago for himself and in my behalf on the question of safety appliances.

Let me digress long enough to comment on accidents in the mining industry. I have been quite impressed with what I think has been a change, which I am afraid is only temporary—but it is well

that it could come even for a short period of time—in the attitude of the American public about passing some drastic and punitive labor legislation seeking to prevent coal strikes by use of Government compulsions.

Since the great tragedy in Illinois, where once again many American miners lost their lives the people of our country have been reflecting rather thoughtfully on the plight of our miners. They are beginning to appreciate the fact that in the mining industry as an industry there is a need for more rigid enforcement of laws requiring devices for the safety and protection of the miners. I think the American people are beginning to appreciate that fact, and I believe they are beginning to appreciate that, in the last analysis, our entire industrial economy, rests on coal. The great mass-production industries of America would be utterly impossible were it not for the services of the thousands of men who go down into the bowels of the earth and dig out the fuel which makes the great American production machine go.

We the public, as their employers—because in the last analysis we are their employers—have during the decades been very bad employers. We have been selfish and greedy employers. A visit to any coal town and an observing of the conditions under which the miners and their families have to live and work, should make us, the public, ashamed of ourselves. We should be particularly ashamed of ourselves when industrial strife develops in the coal industry, and we start demanding long before we know much about the facts that some drastic action be taken against the coal miners. What we should have done 25 and 30 and 40 years ago was to establish an industrial system under which those men could get decent pay for the immensely important public service they render to our entire economy when they mine coal under the extremely hazardous conditions which characterize every deep shaft mine.

Oh, yes; it is easy for us to castigate their leaders. I hold no brief for some of the mistakes of John L. Lewis. I have never hesitated to disagree with Lewis when I thought he was wrong, but I do not promise to ignore the merits of his contentions in support of a fair deal for the miners of America. I do not know where the miners of America would be today if it had not been for the leadership John L. Lewis has given them during the last 20 years. I care not what his critics may say, there is one fight Lewis has made which they cannot condemn, and that is the magnificent fight he has made for safer working conditions in the mines of America. He has pleaded over the years for safety devices and for safety measures which would protect the miners from our thoughtlessness; and when I say "our thoughtlessness" I mean that of the American public. We the public have not been fair to the miners of America. We owe them much. We owe them more than we do any other group of workers in the United States, for they have made possible the great American industrial economy. We have not given

them the protection or the support or the working conditions to which they are entitled. We could well have afforded to heed the warnings which leaders such as Lewis gave us as many as 20 years ago about the plight of the workers in the mines. Much of our labor trouble in the mines would have been avoided if we had insisted upon safe working conditions and high wages which the miners certainly deserve.

I think the time has come when the members of the public should make very clear to the mine operators that no longer can there be any justification for maintaining unsafe mine conditions. The members of the boards of directors of the mining companies should be held responsible for such unsafe conditions. Hence the bill I shall introduce later this week or next week will seek to place criminal responsibility upon the owners and the members of the boards of directors of the mines for the unsafe working conditions which characterize too many mines.

In other words, Mr. President, I say the time has come for the public, for 140,000,000 American people, to measure up to their responsibilities in this field of industrial safety. We have no right to sacrifice each year the great number of men who are sacrificed in the mines of the United States in order that we may obtain coal a little cheaper.

I think Lewis is quite right when he uses the figure of speech—and I paraphrase him—that too much coal goes into the homes of American citizens and into the factories of America "covered with blood." We can cleanse that coal, or rather we can keep the blood off it, Mr. President, by seeing to it that legislation is passed which will require effective enforcement of safety legislation and safety devices in the coal pits of America.

Differ with Lewis as I may on some matters, I do not differ with him when he is fighting to protect the safety and the lives of the rank and file of the coal miners of America, nor do I differ with him when he is fighting to raise the economic level of the miners by getting for them better and more decent wages than they now receive. If we are so dependent as I say we are on the coal miners of America—and no one can successfully dispute that we are, it is an unanswerable premise, for our whole economy is dependent upon them—then they ought to be among the best paid workers in America. I wish that some of the critics of the coal miners could be required to spend just 30 days mining coal or could be required to endure the standards of living which thousands of families of coal miners have to endure now, even in these days. I am satisfied that at the end of the 30 days they would have a better understanding and a greater appreciation of the part coal miners play in America's economy.

In considering labor disputes we should not allow ourselves to be diverted from the fundamental issue; that is, whether or not after one has all of the data before him, after he has had a look into all the facts, can he actually say to himself, "I think the workers in this case are receiving all they are entitled to

receive." I am willing to take that issue any time, as it relates to the coal miners, before any impartial jury in America. I think I know what the verdict will be, because, once given all the facts, the average American who sits on a jury is a very just, fair-minded man. I think the unanimous verdict on this issue will always be, before any jury of Americans, "The coal miners have never received, and they are not now receiving fair treatment at the hands of either the operators or the American public."

Oh, I know long and difficult is the argument when one undertakes to improve the working and safety conditions and the wages of American miners: It is said: "Coal mines cannot operate at a profit and pay better wages." What a sad confession that is! What an unfortunate accusation that is against the private-property system in America!

Senators have heard me say before, Mr. President, and I repeat now, that if we are going to make the private-property system work, then it must work in cooperation with a friendly Government. If it be true that in a given case the coal mines cannot operate at a profit and assure the miners a high standard of living then the Government should spread the cost among us all by an adequate support price. I am talking about a high standard of living for the miners because that is what they are entitled to, in view of the perils of their work, and its tremendous importance to our entire economy. I say if the coal mines cannot operate at a profit and assure the workers a high standard of living, then a friendly Government must come forward and help. Call it anything—"subsidy," "support prices," I care not what—I shall never be a party to any proposal that seeks to require the coal miners of America to subsidize the American people by mining coal at wages which do not permit of a decent standard of living, in order that the rest of us may have cheap coal.

That is a sound premise, that does not do damage to our conception of a private property economy. It is not a socialist premise as some have been want to charge. It is a recognition that, after all, coal is so vital to all of us that we, the public, become employers once removed in the coal industry of the country; and we owe a clear obligation, which is more than a moral obligation, to the miners of coal, to see to it that governmental funds if necessary are used to support the mines, in order that decent wages may be paid.

I think that is better than Government ownership, Mr. President; and yet, mark my words, if we continue down the road we are presently traveling and continue to subject the miners to substandards of living and unsafe working conditions, there will be leftists who will start pleading for Government ownership. I am absolutely opposed to public ownership of the mines because I am an ardent advocate of the private-property system and our system of private enterprise. Yet I do not take the position, Mr. President, that under a so-called free-enterprise system American employers have any right to be free to exploit American work-

ers on the theory that if they pay them better wages they cannot make a profit out of their labor.

In more than one decision I have taken the position that if a particular industry cannot pay a decent wage to free workers, and if it is an industry that is not of sufficient importance to entitle it to Federal aid through some such system as a subsidy or a support price to which I have just referred, then it is better for our economy that such an industry go out of business. I say that because, if we are going to make the private-enterprise system work, it can never survive or justify itself in the exploitation of workers. In this instance, however, we are dealing with an industry of such vital importance to all that we cannot justify letting it go out of existence. Therefore, in order to assure a decent standard of living for the workers in the industry, if it be true—and I use the word "if"—if it be true that the operators cannot pay a decent wage and maintain safe working conditions, then I say it is the obligation of the public, through the Government, to give to this industry whatever aid it needs in behalf of the public, so as to make it unnecessary for the workers in the industry to subsidize the rest of us.

I close this digression, Mr. President, by asserting that for at least 20 years the coal miners of America have to a very large degree been subsidizing the American public by being forced to accept wages and living conditions below that which we, the public, should require of them, and, therefore, we owe a tremendous debt to the coal miners of America to see to it that from now on they shall not be required to work under unsafe mining conditions.

I use that statement, Mr. President, as the introduction to a speech I now desire to make on the question of adequate appropriations for the Division of Labor Standards of the Department of Labor.

Mr. President, I am deeply disturbed over the fact that in connection with the appropriation bill there has developed on the House side a tendency to cut the Labor Department below a minimum amount needed for it to perform efficient service in the year 1948. I understand from the press that the Labor Department appropriation was cut by the House committee 44 percent, and that it was cut later in the House itself another \$1,000,000.

I sympathize with the terrific problems of effectuating economies that the committee faced. If we cut anywhere, we are deluged with telegrams—many doubtless inspired by the agencies crying about the loss of this service or that. I do not envy the job of any member of the Appropriations Committee—House or Senate. They need the wisdom of Solomon and the courage of Daniel.

But I think this body ought to look closely at the Labor Department appropriation bill. I am as opposed to waste and inefficiency as any Member of the Senate, but I seriously doubt whether it is sound public policy to single out the Labor Department for a 47-percent cut when appropriations for the Post Office, I understand, are curtailed by only 1 per-

cent, and for the Treasury less than 5 percent. If the Post Office and Treasury appropriations are to set the pattern, then I do not think the country will understand or approve such a severe cut for the Labor Department. Americans have a great sympathy for what they regard as the "underdog," and I do not believe Congress means to "take it out" on the one agency of Government which the Democrats have starved for years and which serves the largest segment of our people, the wage earners of the United States. In fact, I am very proud, Mr. President, of the record the Republicans made in the early history of the United States Department of Labor. It has been pretty much a child of the Republicans, and I want to say to this new Republican Congress that I think they ought to clothe well their own child. The Democrats have been hard enough on this Department—let us not be worse.

We of the majority have in this appropriation bill a great opportunity to promote and assist in achieving industrial peace in the country. You and I know that such peace is essential to the stability of our economy, to the maintenance of high levels of production and employment. It is essential to meeting our grave and growing international commitments as the greatest industrial nation on earth and is the greatest bulwark against the spread of Communist philosophy. Industrial peace at home is essential to world peace and security.

So I hope that the Senate Appropriations Committee will hold public hearings on this appropriation bill. The organization of the other House does not facilitate the holding of public hearings and I believe that, before it acts, this body ought to have before it the facts on the usefulness or otherwise of the Labor Department's services to the wage earners of America. I do not believe we ought to depend solely on the testimony of Labor Department officials. I think they appear before us necessarily as special pleaders, and I always view with some reservation the testimony of a special pleader. But I think we can bring before us, Mr. President, at hearings in the Senate committee, a great many citizens who will not be special witnesses or special pleaders, but who can give impartial and objective testimony as to the value, for example, of the Division of Labor Standards to American industry. Let us find out whether their official testimony is corroborated by those, or representatives of those whom their services are supposed to benefit.

I will have more to say later about other aspects of this appropriation bill. Today I want to confine my remarks to my concern over the proposed elimination of a little agency in the Labor Department which I have always thought of as the ounce of prevention that is better and certainly cheaper than the pound of cure in labor disputes. I refer to the Division of Labor Standards. Now I venture to guess that some Senators may never have heard of this agency because it works basically through other people. It works to strengthen State labor departments, helps them to develop

methods. Through them, it strives to reduce industrial accidents which cost American industry and labor \$3,500,000,000 a year. Through its labor education service, it helps prevent costly strikes by helping management and unions train responsible and competent representatives in the peaceful administration of union contracts. It provides the only information available in the Federal Government on State labor laws and administration. It promotes close Federal-State cooperation. On all this service, it is expending \$652,000 for the current year and has been allotted \$865,000 for 1948.

I know this agency well. I have long used its services and so have many of my constituents. I have referred to it many times, Mr. President, when I have been faced with the problem of writing an arbitration decision in a labor case involving data on which this particular agency could give me expert advice.

In the first place, the Division of Labor Standards was created by congressional funds in 1934 as an arm of the Secretary's office. It acts as a service agency to State labor departments, management and labor, and civic organizations in the fields I have mentioned. Last July, when the Children's Bureau was transferred to the Federal Security Agency under the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2, as approved by the Congress, the administration of the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the research and promotion of standards in the child-labor and youth-employment field were amalgamated into the Division of Labor Standards. That is one reason, Mr. President, why additional rather than less funds will be required for 1948.

The Division was set up in response to repeated appeals from State labor officials and labor organizations for a Federal agency to act as a clearinghouse for sound, tested experience in our most advanced industrial States, in the Federal field, and even in other lands. They wanted an agency that was not supposed to be a policeman and enforce a considerable body of law, that did not want to take over State functions, but one to which they could go with their problems, whatever they were in job-safety or labor-law administration, and get technically competent assistance in solving them. One of the formal recommendations for the establishment of the Division was made at the first National Conference on Labor Legislation called by the Secretary of Labor in 1933. The Governors of the States were asked to send State labor commissioners and representatives of organized labor, and there was initiated what has become an annual institution arranged by the Division of Labor Standards. The value of these conferences is repeatedly attested by the demands of delegates for their continuance.

The Republican Party has for years opposed the further encroachment of the Federal Government in the field of States' rights. It has wanted to strengthen the States. The Division of Labor Standards has been an effective instrumentality for furthering that pur-

pose. Busy State labor officials cannot write to the 48 States every time a problem, say of drafting a safety code or meeting some child-labor situation develops, in order to find out how their neighbors handle it. And if they did find out, they still would not know which was the best practice. It is far more economical to have a little clearinghouse in the Federal Government whose technicians have that information on tap at all times. We do not want Federal agencies taking over State functions; so it would seem the part of wisdom to meet the State labor officials' repeated requests for assistance in solving their problems so that they can perform their work creditably. It is where the States could not do or have not done a necessary job creditably that Federal encroachment has grown. It will grow in this field—there will be irresistible pressure upon the Congress one day to take over many of the things State labor departments are now trying to do unless they do such a good job that no one will challenge their jurisdiction. To do this job they need help.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, certain communications I have received from State labor officials of my home State, which prompted me to make the speech I am making here this afternoon; communications in which these State officials and labor leaders plead for the continuation, adequately financed and supported, of the various services in the United States Department of Labor.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE COUNCIL,
LUMBER AND SAWMILL WORKERS,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD CARPENTERS
AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Portland, Oreg., April 2, 1947.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have received information that the Senate Appropriations Committee will consider the appropriations for the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act in its next session to be held Monday, April 7.

I have also learned that in accordance with the action taken by the House Appropriations Committee in reducing appropriations by 25 percent, it would necessitate the closure of some regional offices, and likewise would force the closure of several subregional offices, one of which would be the Portland office.

The closing of the Portland office would be a very grave mistake inasmuch as the expansion of industry in the State of Oregon no doubt exceeds that of any State on the Pacific coast. I have particular reference to the expansion of the lumber and logging industry in the State of Oregon. The production of lumber and logs in the State of Oregon will be far greater than any other State in the United States for the next several years. In addition, there are numerous other industries either already in the category of being transferred or constructed within the State of Oregon.

The records of the United States Conciliation Service as well as the records of the National Labor Relations Board will show that there has been far greater activity in the

State of Oregon than in the States of Washington, Idaho or Montana.

This is equally true of the wage and hour office in Portland, and any action which would necessitate the closure of the Portland office would greatly handicap both labor and industry in this State.

I believe it to be imperative that regardless of the appropriations which are allowed that the wage and hour office should continue in Portland so as to provide sufficient service to labor and industry in this State.

I believe the same to be true of both the United States Conciliation Service and the National Labor Relations Board. If the State of Oregon is deprived of either of these offices it would render a great hardship upon all those who are dependent upon these offices for efficient service.

I therefore respectfully request that you give careful consideration to this matter, and if it is possible, that you contact those who are members of the Senate Appropriations Committee who may be interested in taking such action that will give the best service where it is needed most.

Thanking you for your cooperation in this matter, and with the very best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

DOYLE PEARSON,
Secretary.

GRANTS PASS, OREG., April 4, 1947.

WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senator,

Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request you take action to restore cut in appropriations for Bureau of Labor, National Labor Relations Board and Wage and Hour Division.

LOCAL 9-308, IWA,
ALBERT A. CLARK, Secretary.

STATE OF OREGON,
BUREAU OF LABOR,
WAGE AND HOUR COMMISSION,
Salem, Oreg., March 13, 1947.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I understand that Congress is considering eliminating the appropriation for the Division of Labor Standards of the United States Department of Labor.

The Division of Labor Standards has very materially assisted the State labor departments with their activities in assuring safe places of employment, and I am certain that the labor departments will rely on the service provided by the Division of Labor Standards to an even greater extent in the future.

Any effort you may make to assure an appropriation sufficient to enable the Division of Labor Standards to continue this service will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

W. E. KIMSEY,
Commissioner of Labor.

STATE OF OREGON,
BUREAU OF LABOR,
WAGE AND HOUR COMMISSION,
Salem, Oreg., March 29, 1947.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I doubt if any State has an adequate industrial safety program, or personnel for administering it, which is due to the reluctance of the States to properly finance such programs.

We have relied on the Division of Labor Standards for advice and statistics on a national scale to supplement local efforts to provide protection to our industrial workers. That Department has been very cooperative in supplying statistics, charts, and personnel, when needed. Since last fall the Division of Labor Standards has been assisting in the

preparation of a program, educational in nature, which, it is felt, might result in a reduction in accidents.

The assistance offered by the Division of Labor Standards is important.

Very truly yours,

W. E. KIMSEY,
Commissioner of Labor.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, what the House Appropriations Committee says in its report is quite true, that industrial safety is a field in which the States have supreme authority. But I think the Senate ought to examine carefully whether it is in the interests of true economy to eliminate, as the appropriation bill now does, all Federal funds for assistance to the States in industrial safety and health.

The House Appropriations Committee in its report continues:

While it may be said that the advice of a few experts in safety and sanitation is perhaps in the public interest, the committee feels that the Federal Government should in the interests of economy curtail many functions that might be considered worthwhile when the Government is not burdened with debt as it is at the present time. The committee therefore feels that inasmuch as industrial safety must be accomplished by State law, that any efforts of the Federal Government in this field are gratuities extended to the States and can safely be discontinued until some future period.

Let us examine the record of the Nation's industrial accidents. The facts are all contained in the hearings before the House Appropriations Committee, which I have examined very carefully.

Last year 2,000,000 workers were injured in the factories of America. Two million injuries are a great many injuries, Mr. President. Sixteen thousand of those injuries resulted in deaths. I am talking about injuries in the factories of America. I am talking about the terrible cost to life and limb of our mass production system. I am talking about an obligation on the part of all the people to do whatever can be done through legislation to reduce to a minimum this fearful toll of industrial accidents. I am pleading here this afternoon—in a very academic way, I admit—for money in the pending appropriation bill adequately to support the one little division in the United States Department of Labor which is doing such a fine job in carrying across this land the lessons of industrial safety.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics such injuries cost American wage earners more than one and a half billion dollars in 1946. They cost American industry more than \$1,800,000,000, or a total waste to the Nation of about three and three-fourths billion dollars. The irony of this picture is that at least 90 percent of this waste was preventable. We know how to prevent accidents. A generation of safety experience has developed tested techniques. The job is to apply the know-how to industry itself. The fact is that 70 percent of the injuries occurred in plants which have not been reached by the safety movement. I think that is a very vital statistic. I believe it is very important that we adequately support the little agency which makes available to us such objective data as these, because the fact that

70 percent of these accidents occurred in factories which have not yet been reached by the safety movement constitutes a powerful argument for continuation of the service.

It is the job of the Division of Labor Standards to assist the States in reducing an appalling and needless toll; and yet, to carry on a job of this magnitude, the Congress has appropriated \$80,000 for this Division in 1947. I understand that for 1948 the House proposes to give them nothing, on the theory that the States can best carry on the work of safety education. What I am arguing is that the States and the Federal Government, in friendly cooperation, with the Federal Government working as a clearing house of information, must do this job as partners. Many social and economic problems involve dual attack if they are to be successfully solved—attack both by the States and by the Federal Government.

The Division of Labor Standards, at the urgent request of State labor departments, has attempted to reconvert its magnificent wartime experience into peacetime usefulness. What was the wartime record of the Division in accident reduction? Alone among the great industrial nations of the earth, the United States reduced job accidents in the midst of a war. England's accident rate soared until the end, as did that of Canada.

If I were asked where I obtained these data, my reply would be that I obtained them from the records of the very agency for the continuation of which I am pleading. I do not know where we would get this evidence if the House proposal to eliminate entirely appropriations for the agency should finally prevail. But how can we intelligently gage the problem of industrial safety in this country unless we have the basic data on which to work?

As for Germany, available facts make us almost believe that no effort was made in Germany to conserve industrial manpower during the war. It was said that it could not be done in America, but it was done. In 1942 there was a terrific accident rate in this country. That rate was slowed down in 1943. In 1944, in the midst of the war job, accidents actually decreased 8 percent as compared with what they were in 1943; and in 1945 there were 200,000 fewer accidents than in the previous year. What happened during that period? What is the explanation of this fine record?

When defense and war production got under way, the Division of Labor Standards realized that industrial expansion would mean increased accidents. It knew there were not enough trained safety engineers in the country to stem the tide. So it organized the National Committee for the Conservation of Manpower in War Industries. It enlisted the services of over 600 of the best safety engineers in private industry who volunteered 20 percent of their time to assist smaller plants in reducing accidents. That was a fine type of civilian wartime service.

The Division worked closely with the war safety units hurriedly created in the War, Navy, and other procurement

agencies. It worked with State labor departments and private safety organizations. In cooperation with the Office of Education, it inaugurated the greatest safety training program this country has ever had. About 65,000 key plant supervisors and union representatives were trained in some 116 engineering colleges in the analysis of plant accident experience, the detection and control of plant hazards and unsafe work practices, the establishment of plant safety organizations, the training of foremen and workers on the job, and the general enlistment of worker cooperation in safety. Some half million foremen received on-the-job training. The organization of classes, the teaching of classes, the preparation of text material all came from the Division's national committee.

That is what turned the tide of job accidents in America during the war. If that had not been done, if the accident rate had continued to go up in 1944 and 1945 as it had in previous years, it would have resulted in a loss of something like \$1,500,000,000. If this little agency—this ounce of prevention—was responsible for only a fraction of the drop—say 10 percent, which I believe grossly underestimates its effectiveness—the savings would have been \$150,000,000. That is a pretty good return on the \$300,000 the Federal Government was then investing in the Division's war-safety work. Of course, far more important than dollars and cents was the precious manpower required for war production. I am stressing dollars because we are talking about appropriations and there seems to be a tendency to be very dollar-conscious in regard to certain types of savings.

Let me digress, Mr. President, to say that I hope the time has not come when we shall place a dollar value on the life and limbs of the American worker. If I can sustain my premise, if I can sustain what I believe to be true—namely, that this little division in the United States Department of Labor has made a material contribution to the lessening of the industrial-accident rate in this country—then certainly we Members of Congress should not attempt to evaluate it on a dollar basis. We should evaluate it in terms of the human values that have been saved as a result of the work of this little division.

If such a program as this is dispensed with, we shall have a hard time—and we should have a hard time—explaining to the industrial workers of America, who have to suffer from such accidents, why we paid tribute to dollar values when we considered the appropriation bill, but overlooked the great human values which are protected by an adequate Federal safety program.

With the end of the war, the emergency safety agencies of the Federal Government, including the Division's manpower conservation committee, were liquidated, and the major burden for accident prevention returned to State labor departments. That liquidation meant that the Division's \$300,000 war-time safety appropriation was reduced to \$80,000. Despite this fact, the States

when confronted with sole responsibility for such a burden, urgently requested technical assistance from the Division.

Why did the States seek this assistance? Because they have only about 500 State inspectors to safeguard the working conditions of upwards of 40,000,000 workers subject to the protection of State safety laws. The accident rate began to go up as soon as Federal services were removed. Now obviously the States are inadequately staffed at present to meet their responsibilities and their labor commissioners have repeatedly admitted it.

The letters which I have placed in the RECORD already attest to that in language much more persuasive than any I could possibly use.

Yet these State labor departments are the only agency of State governments that cannot get assistance or any funds from the Federal Government.

From this review of the Nation's industrial accident problem and of the record of the Division of Labor Standards, I think the Senate ought to examine carefully the elimination of this agency's service in the appropriations bill. I fear it will be difficult to convince workers and employers that the bill's sole motive is economy. If it is, it is a false economy; it is a penny-wise and pound-foolish economy. There is no field in which the expenditure of a few thousands will bring such dividends as in the field of industrial safety. Therefore American management and labor—which have an equal stake in safety—may well interpret this bill as a deliberate desire to withhold vital Federal services.

They will perceive inconsistencies in this bill too. It eliminates Federal funds for accident prevention on the grounds that such work is a State function. But it also appropriates \$18,000,000, an increase of \$6,000,000 over present funds to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation for grants to States to carry on rehabilitation programs which have for their purpose the restoration to employable capacity of persons injured in industry.

Of course, that is an inconsistency that cannot be explained, Mr. President. If we are willing to appropriate Federal money—and we should—to rehabilitate those who have been injured in industry, then we ought to be willing to appropriate adequate sums to help prevent injuries in the first instance.

Vocational rehabilitation is as much a State function as is accident prevention. On what grounds, we shall be asked, does the same bill withhold funds for assisting States in accident prevention and grant them with such a generous hand, to mop up after the accidents occur? Do not misunderstand me. I am for vocational rehabilitation, but I suggest that we shall be open to justifiable attack for confining our concern to locking the door after the horse is stolen. We shall be accused of other motives than economy. Here again is where the ounce of prevention—the Division of Labor Standards—in my judgment, ought to be supported.

This same appropriation bill also grants funds for work with the States in vocational education, in apprentice training, and in public health—all of them as much State functions as industrial safety. I repeat my earnest hope that the Senate will examine this bill with great care and recognize these inconsistencies.

I say again that I am very much in favor of adequate support for apprentice training, vocational education, and public health; but I see no justification for supporting those services and at the same time discriminating against the one division of the Department of Labor which has done such a magnificent job in protecting health and preventing industrial accidents.

Another field in which the Division of Labor Standards has saved the Federal Government money is in working out agreements with State labor departments whereby State inspectors inspect plants for violations of the safety provisions of the Public Contracts Act. There have been some 15,000 such State inspections which have saved the Federal Government some \$750,000. Not only that, but having qualified State inspectors inspect for Federal as well as State laws saves duplicate inspections by both agencies and confusion and annoyance to employers which result from one inspector after another running into their plants.

Yet this work of strengthening State labor departments by eliminating duplication of inspections is eliminated entirely in this appropriation bill, and I am pleading for its restoration by the Senate.

Another provision of this bill will be questioned, I think, by labor and also by management in this country. It is the transfer of the labor education service from the Division of Labor Standards to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In its report, the House Appropriations Committee says that this service is "almost a complete duplication" of the work of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. If that were so, I certainly would be in favor of consolidating them.

I suppose it well might appear so to a committee so overburdened with work and responsibility for reviewing so many detailed budget estimates, and who do not hold themselves out as authorities in the growing and complex field of industrial relations. But those of us who have spent our lives in this field and been close to the work of the Labor Department for years, can assure you that nothing could be further from the facts.

I suppose every Commissioner of Labor Statistics from Carroll Wright, the Bureau's first and very distinguished chief, on down to the present one, has had to defend and protect the purity of the Bureau's fact-finding function. The Bureau of Labor Statistics' sole purpose is to collect and analyze facts and let the chips fall where they may. It does not exist to recommend public policies that may be indicated by those findings of fact. It does not exist to advise groups of any kind on the development of programs and activities that it or somebody

else might think desirable as a result of its findings of fact. If it did any of these things, its whole value as an impartial fact-finding agency whose analyses are accepted by everybody, management, labor and the public alike, would be forever lost.

I digress to pay a very deserved compliment to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Mr. President, because as one who has participated in a great many hearings in the field of labor disputes I have found that both attorneys for employers, and attorneys for labor equally cite and stand upon the reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Certainly it has won for itself the hearty approval of industry and labor alike as to its impartiality and as to the reliability of its statistics. If one offers in evidence in any major labor arbitration case an exhibit based upon Bureau of Labor Statistics figures, he very quickly can obtain from opposing counsel a stipulation that he will not be required further to identify the exhibit or to offer further proof in substantiation of its factual basis. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has made a great record in that respect.

Therefore, I do not think the Senate should, as the appropriation bill passed by the House of Representatives does, append to the Bureau of Labor Statistics the function of applying its statistics to controversial or educational issues and making recommendations for State action on the basis of its statistics. It should not enter into the field of controversy, because the moment that is done I think the tremendous prestige which the Bureau of Labor Statistics now enjoys among both labor groups and employer groups will be greatly weakened.

Mr. President, the Bureau of Labor Statistics must be, like Caesar's wife, wholly above suspicion. The Bureau must be wholly above suspicion as to its accuracy and objectivity. I doubt very much that the present Commissioner of Labor Statistics would want this extension of function, and he should not have it thrust upon him.

It is not necessary to ruin the reputation for objectivity of the Bureau of Labor Statistics by giving it an advisory and developmental job like the Labor Education Service. Let us return it to the Division of Labor Standards, for it is certainly not in the interest of economy to tear this 3- or 4-year-old baby from the arms of its mother and thrust it upon an unwilling foster parent. The Division of Labor Standards has developed this experimental program, and has given it leadership and planning. Its administrators have gained experience in what is a new and untried field. Transferring this service to the Bureau of Labor Statistics will not be economy, but will compromise its foster parent, and possibly will deprive some 15,000,000 Americans of the chance to become responsible union members, and will deprive their leaders of the opportunity to become technically competent officials in the peaceful art of labor-management relations.

I repeat, Mr. President, the Republican Party has committed itself to the attainment of industrial peace. Did we

mean what we said, or did we not? The country is awaiting with interest the answer to that question. I have given much of my professional life to devising policies and methods for the attainment of industrial peace. A number of us in the Senate have spent considerable time during these last months in attempting to devise public policies which will promote it, through fair legislation. But I am prepared to state that there are only certain things we can do by law which will help and not hinder in the effort to attain that goal. Along with most of American management and labor, I am convinced that there is much that can be done by education, and that if the Government and the Republican Party are really sincere in their desire to foster industrial peace, they will support this pioneer agency which is helping management, unions, and universities to promote industrial peace by means of education.

The Labor Education Service of the Division of Labor Standards advises with universities, unions, and other interested groups on the establishment of labor education programs.

There must be some agency of the Federal Government which is free to give guidance and advice in the development of the schools which are to provide this education. This function cannot be performed either by a fact-finding agency or by our regular educational authorities without assistance from persons skilled in industrial relations problems. For many reasons, labor is suspicious of certain schools. Management is suspicious of others. Many universities are suspicious of labor, while others hesitate to make their facilities available because they fear controversies within their cloistered walls.

The Division of Labor Standards has already had notable success in bringing these parties together in several States so that the end result was the establishment of a sound industrial relations program in those States.

Finding reliable, simply written, unbiased text material is also a problem for these educators and these workers and these employers. As we know, libraries on the study of labor and industry problems are very extensive. Much less is there text material prepared for the use of workers—men and women whose life has not brought them into contact with the language of the academicians.

I recommend the text materials written by the Division of Labor Standards for workers for adult education programs, which are used in the institutions I have mentioned and a great many more.

Mr. President, I have brought some of that material with me, although I shall not take time to read many excerpts from it. I recommend to all Members of the Senate a reading of the evidence and of the material which the Division of Labor Standards has made available to the various labor education institutes and conferences throughout the country. If Senators read it I think they will agree with me that the small amount of funds used to publish the material was well used. These texts represent a

part of the investment by the people of the United States in this labor education agency of theirs.

For example, I have before me an excellent bulletin entitled "Federal Labor Laws and Agencies, a Guide for Shop Stewards and Supervisors." This is the basis for a course on the all-important subject of Federal labor legislation about which workers in so many factories in the United States are constantly asking their shop stewards. We frequently find that when their stewards are in a position to give them accurate answers to their questions a potential labor dispute or a potential labor grievance is killed at its very beginning. This bulletin is in use by thousands of persons and hundreds of educational institutions, although it has been published for only 2 months. The demand for this guide is enormous. Why is that so? Because an objective, readable, easily understood digest of Federal labor laws and agencies has been badly needed in our industrial system. I think many of my colleagues will find it helpful to their reading, too. It would not have been published by and State agency. Here is a good example of the need of a cooperative Federal-State program.

I read the following from it, for example:

Many serious plant grievances, unnecessary appeals to Government bodies and much litigation can be averted, we believe, when stewards and supervisors have a clear understanding of their mutual rights and obligations and know what agencies can help them with special problems.

With all of the discussion we have heard of the foreman's right to organize, there has been little discussion of the foreman's function in labor relations. Many training programs for foremen had been worked out by private publishers and by management itself, but none of them even touched on the foreman's job as a leader of men in plants operating under a collective-bargaining agreement. It took this little Division of Labor Standards to provide a guide to the foreman in the field of labor relations.

Mr. President, I shall not take time to read extensively from the guide, but I recommend it to my colleagues, for here again, I think they will find that the money required for its publication has been well spent, because a great deal of use is being made of this little guide in thousands of plants in the United States. A foreman using the guide which the Division prepared will have a better understanding of the position he holds as a direct representative of management in all matters involving the application of the company's labor-relations program.

This pamphlet, as well as other publications of the Division, was not developed by a swivel-chair artist. It was gone over word for word and revised again and again with the help of some of the leading industrial-relations directors of the country. As a result, it has been widely used by management throughout the United States. Many large plants, such as General Electric, have reprinted it for use by all of their foremen. Others have bought thousands of copies for distribution. Where-

ever it has been used, it has brought about better understanding between management and labor.

Here is a fundamental approach to the solution of troubles resulting from grievances. As a member of the War Labor Board, and throughout my career in the field of industrial relations, I have seen grievances built up into major catastrophes—and often because there was no understanding of the issues at the moment an alleged grievance was charged. Many times I have wished for some educational material in this field. And here it is—simple, accurate explanations of these Federal laws—laws which are sometimes so difficult to interpret as written that even we cannot understand them at the first reading.

I refer to another new text of the Division of Labor Standards, Arbitration of Grievances. The value of arbitration is unquestioned by students of industrial relations. But how many workers put their faith in arbitration? How many fear that third party? How many would rather just fight it out themselves on the picket line? This pamphlet contains the advantages, and disadvantages, of a number of types of arbitration proceedings. How many workers and how many employers really know this subject so that they will be convinced it is a good system and ought to be written into every labor-management contract? This booklet is their education. I want to see this used all over this land—in colleges and universities who are helping to teach workers and employers, in union halls, and, yes, at executive board meetings of giant corporations. And it might not be amiss for Members of Congress to know the various types of arbitration proceedings which have developed to suit a particular situation.

I say that, Mr. President, because, as my colleagues know from remarks I have made on the floor of the Senate in times past, I believe that voluntary arbitration is the best last step for the settlement of labor disputes. I am convinced that once the employers of America, the labor leaders of America, and the rank and file, come to educate themselves on the advantages of arbitration, which are set forth so clearly in this book issued by the Division of Labor Standards, we will find more collective-bargaining agreements containing arbitration clauses.

I do not want to be a party, when it comes to acting on the appropriation bill this year, to voting out of existence a division in the Federal Government that is serving such a much-needed educational work for American employers and labor in the field of arbitration.

These are only three of a number of good, simplified, understandable texts that are an answer to a puzzled man's dreams.

I maintain that these pamphlets are admirably objective—more so than any union or management pamphlet on these subjects that I have seen. The fact that management uses them as generally as does labor would verify my statement.

The Division of Labor Standards has developed the experience and leadership in this field and should in my opinion

be permitted to continue. I can see no economy but rather an expensive disruption of service in shifting this activity to a fact-finding agency which ought not to be burdened with giving the kind of guidance that unions and universities request from the Division. I call the Senate's attention to the type of requests submitted in evidence at the hearings before the House Appropriations Committee. The Senate will find them not only instructive but interesting, I am sure. Let me read a few excerpts from those hearings.

Here is one from management—from the industrial relations director of a Northwest shipyard:

We are very much interested in a program for labor education to help the company and the union start a labor-education course. We are interested in outlines of courses as well as text material. Please furnish us with any information you may have along these lines.

Immediately there went out such bulletins as I referred to earlier in my speech.

Here are examples of what union officials request.

A Midwest State federation of labor:

We are interested in getting information and background material for a worker educational program in our State, and we would be happy to receive any material or outlines that have been developed in your department.

An education director for a CIO international union commenting on what is needed:

I would stress basic collective-bargaining aids, available at no cost or at little cost. The material should be prepared for workers with little or no education in unionism. If the material is highfalutin' or expensive it will prove of little assistance to those who need it most.

An A. F. of L. international officer in Philadelphia:

In the immediate near future many of our locals in this area are contemplating educational programs, and we would appreciate if you would send us some outlines that your Department may have available for such an undertaking.

And now from universities and colleges. The University of Illinois:

One of the most urgent needs at this time is the establishment of a really comprehensive central clearinghouse which will have available information on all programs both in unions and in universities. I am sure that is a function which can be most effectively carried out through your Division.

The University of Colorado:

The University of Colorado has been interested for some time in this phase of adult education work and has cooperated with labor groups in holding institutes on a number of occasions. We have not, however, had anything in the way of a continuing program, although we feel we are now beginning to get the foundation on which one can be built. We are very much interested in the development of your services in the field of workers' education and hope that you will keep us informed concerning them.

The University of Wyoming:

As you probably know, we are planning a program of labor education which includes extension courses in various centers and a labor college or workshop in our summer

camp for 1 week this summer. We are, therefore, very much interested in materials which will help us in this enterprise.

Xavier Labor School, New York City:

These pamphlets (published by the Division of Labor Standards) have been of great assistance to us in this volunteer work of running schools to train union men in the tools of running their organizations. Here we have more than 200 men to whom we offer 19 courses. * * * We've found that the pamphlets dealing with the work of shop stewards and with grievance procedures have been extremely helpful. From my own knowledge I know what a change in relations has ensued in several shops, where the men of the school introduced orderly handling of bees as your booklet outlines. These have been of great help.

Brooklyn College:

It has just come to my attention that the Division of Labor Standards is in a position to give assistance to groups planning classes in labor legislation and collective bargaining. Brooklyn College is initiating an extensive program of adult education in March 1947. We are intensely interested in any material you have which will be of help in this type of work.

Senators will notice that what these groups ask for most is advice and guidance in planning educational programs—and it can be seen from the hard-boiled union official I quoted that neither the advice nor the pamphlets will be useful if they are "high-falutin'." The kind of help they want is what the Division of Labor Standards is peculiarly equipped to give. I hope the Senate will examine the appropriation bill's proposed transfer of labor education to the Bureau of Labor Statistics with great care before committing itself to the change.

Finally I come to the last proposal of the House Appropriations Committee, which is not going to be understood or, I think, accepted by the women's organizations and other groups in the country dedicated to the control of child labor and the advancement of employment and educational opportunities for the Nation's youth.

As I mentioned previously, when the Children's Bureau was transferred last July to the Federal Security Agency under Reorganization Plan No. 2, the child-labor and youth-employment functions of the Bureau came to the Division of Labor Standards. The Child Labor and Youth Employment Branch of the Division administers the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, does research on undesirable and hazardous employments for children and youth, and works with State labor departments and labor and community organizations in improving standards and promoting educational and employment opportunities for youth. The 1947 appropriations for this function totaled approximately \$300,000. The House Appropriations Committee proposes to halve this amount and transfer the whole business to the Wage and Hour Division of the Labor Department.

I understand there is an inclination to increase the amount somewhat, the exact figure I do not know, but I am informed it still is a very slight sum.

Now let us examine to ascertain what this means. In the first place, these child-labor functions were originally set up in the Children's Bureau, which was created by a Republican Congress back in 1912 and approved by a Republican President. Thus a long and outstanding record of service to the Nation's youth has been built up. When the Fair Labor Standards Act was under consideration by Congress—I remember because I followed the deliberations very closely by reading—Congress had a series of proposals before it. It carefully considered whether to place administrative authority for the enforcement of the act's child-labor provisions in the Wage and Hour Division or in the Children's Bureau. In every proposal, as I recall it, the experience of the Children's Bureau was called in to some degree. The final proposal was to place full administrative authority in the Children's Bureau. That is the function now performed by the Child Labor and Youth Employment Branch of the Division of Labor Standards. So what the Labor Department-Federal Security Agency bill proposes to do by appropriation is actually to contravene the considered judgment of Congress.

It even goes further. In addition to placing the difficult enforcement job that surrounds child labor in the hands of an agency which has carried the far simpler techniques of wage-hour enforcement, the bill proposes to place the research and youth-employment functions in the same agency. I do not know how many women's organizations and youth-serving agencies other Senators have heard from but I have already heard from a good many. The cry is essentially a simple one. They say, what do a bunch of inspectors—accountants, if you please—who are accustomed to checking pay rolls know about ferreting out dead-end jobs for kids, investigating hazardous jobs for youth, advising State labor officials and groups in developing child labor, labor standards, and educational opportunities. They say such servants know nothing about the basic problems. They say, the battle for the abolition of child labor has not been won entirely. As a result of war, there are some two and one-half times as many youngsters at work today as in 1940. A million less are in high school than in 1941. Experienced advice and guidance such as has long been developed in the Child Labor and Youth Employment Branch and the Division of Labor Standards is still very much needed, say these women's organizations. I believe they are entirely right about it. It is not economy to halve the appropriations for the protection of the country's most valuable asset—its future citizenry—and put administration in an agency that is not equipped to handle it.

I must say I agree basically with these protagonists of the Nation's youth. Of all the charges that we should scrupulously avoid having leveled at the Republican Party, the exploitation of children and the encouragement of sweatshops should be the first. I think as a party we should make doubly sure that we are seeing to it that adequate appropriations are granted by the Congress to maintain the vigilance necessary to prevent ex-

ploitation of the children of America. All one would have to do, to see what would happen without an alert and an experienced child-labor agency, is to look at certain maps that I have in front of me, but which, again, I shall not take time to describe in any particular detail, though I do want to point out an objective statistic or two shown by these maps.

Only 14 States today have a 16-year minimum age for the employment of youth in factories. Only 4 States have a 16-year minimum for all employment during school hours. A few others have such a standard during school hours but permit a number of exceptions.

As a people we are likely to sit back complacently and think we have the highest child-labor standards on earth. We have not, and the Republican Party cannot afford to be charged with deliberately lowering them by not providing at this session of Congress adequate funds to continue these child-labor services.

In summary, may I say that I hope the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate itself will carefully scrutinize both the functions of Government for which 1948 funds are requested and also the appropriations bill as approved by the House. We cannot afford to require the greatest sacrifices from one element of society, namely, the working people of America. Let us be realistic about it. We are not going to cripple seriously the agency that serves the Nation's businessmen, if we exercise good judgment. We should not hamstring the agency that serves the Nation's farmers. I am sure we will not. If 16,000 cattle were dying of hoof-and-mouth disease somewhere in the United States, we would leap to our feet on the floor of the Senate to urge a hasty appropriation to prevent such a plague from overtaking the livestock industry of the country. In fact, it was only a few weeks ago that some of us in the Chamber now, including myself, stood up on the floor of the Senate and pleaded for the quick passage of a bill to make available to the United States Department of Agriculture any sum of money necessary to protect us from a threatened hoof-and-mouth disease invasion from Mexico. We did not even stipulate how much, Mr. President; we were very careful not to stipulate how much; we simply said, no matter what the cost, we must give to the United States Department of Agriculture whatever it may need to stop the spread of hoof-and-mouth disease among the cattle of Mexico. I was for that because it is very important that the spread of hoof-and-mouth disease from Mexico into the livestock industry of America be prevented, because it would cost us a tremendous economic loss if we failed to prevent it. I pleaded for that bill. I am pleading now, Mr. President, also, for funds to help prevent the exploitation through child labor of American boys and girls. I think we must always be ready to appropriate whatever funds are necessary to protect human values, as I said earlier in my remarks this afternoon.

Thus, I say I think we Republicans, who are a majority in the Congress, should not hesitate to do all we can to prevent 16,000,000 human beings from

being killed and injured in American industry. We should appropriate adequate financial support to our industrial accident-safety program. The Bureau of Labor Standards is vital to such a program.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to say a word of appreciation to the members of the Appropriation Committees because I know how difficult is the job that confronts the members of the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate. I know we have the responsibility bringing about economies in the cost of administering the Federal Government. As I said before, I shall favor economizing if the economy does not involve a "penny-wise and pound-foolish" policy. But as I have said previously of the great wealth-producing projects which are being slashed too drastically in the name of economy, I now say in regard to such services as I have pleaded for here this afternoon, we cheat the American people if we seek to give them the impression that by reducing or eliminating appropriations for those services we are saving them money.

We are not saving them money; we are costing them in my judgment many values which they are entitled to receive even from an economy-minded Republican Congress. But I want to say to my colleagues of the Senate Committee on Appropriations that they will have my cooperation in eliminating services which can in fact be dispensed with without costing great values. But the services of the Labor Department, particularly in this time of great industrial unrest in the country, we cannot afford to destroy. I have no doubt that some economy may be exacted in some of the labor services; but I am afraid that if we go forward with the appropriation bill which the House seems to approve in regard to the labor services, we will be guilty of causing labor unrest.

I have one more point on this subject, and then I am through.

The maintenance of industrial peace is going to cost money. We are now dealing with the problem of labor legislation. Still if the National Labor Relations Board is going to be enlarged, as is proposed in one bill, for example, so that it can exercise greater jurisdiction over certain types of disputes—and I certainly think it should, and that is why I have introduced the bill—we shall be obliged to give it more money so as to perform the duties called for by the bill. Yet it is another service which finds itself thus far at least in the appropriation hearings confronted with a drastic budget cut. I think that is another example of false economy.

I was told this morning as I was seeking additional data for my speech, that the National Labor Relations Board is now from 4 to 6 months behind in its simple election cases. What does that mean? Mr. President, imagine yourself for a moment a union organizer; you have organized a plant and you know for an absolute certainty that, let us say, 70 or 80 percent of the workers in the plant wish to have your union be the certified collective bargaining agent for the workers in the plant. However, your employer refuses to accept your state-

ment that you have the workers organized, and he says, "I will not bargain with you until you can obtain an election from the National Labor Relations Board." You check into the matter and are told by the National Labor Relations Board that because of the backlog of election cases already on the docket the Board cannot get to your case in from 4 to 6 months.

Mr. President, what do you think you would be tempted to do? I think you would be tempted to do what a great many labor leaders are doing. You would pull the plug, so to speak. You would "hit the bricks". You would say to that employer, "We are not going to wait 4 months or 6 months to be certified by the National Labor Relations Board in order to get a fair contract with you. We are going to get it from you by strike action right now."

That, Mr. President, is the relationship, and it shows the very direct relationship between appropriations and labor peace in this country. The Congress must assume its fair share of the responsibility for some of the strikes because to the extent that we do not appropriate the necessary funds for these labor agencies which are charged with the responsibility of administering the labor laws, we are responsible for some of the strikes.

My friends on the National Labor Relations Board tell me that there is an increase in the number of strikes against delays by the Board, because the Board cannot get to the cases fast enough to hold elections quickly enough. I do not condone that type of a strike any more than I condone the employer who uses the backlog of cases which confronts the National Labor Relations Board as a stall and a delay in entering into negotiations with a union which in many instances he well knows has the majority of his employees. But he has the right, under the law, to say "I do not have to bargain with you until you are certified by the National Labor Relations Board." I do not condone the conduct of either group any more than I condone the conduct of either group in the present telephone strike, about which I have spoken on the Senate floor heretofore. I digress only to repeat my statement to both groups, that I think neither group can justify its failure to agree to a reasonable arbitration agreement to be drafted by the Secretary of Labor. But that is another story.

I close on this point, Mr. President, by saying that we Members of Congress cannot shuffle off our responsibilities for labor unrest if we fail in the appropriation bill this year to appropriate the necessary funds so labor agencies created by law can dispose of their cases quickly, expeditiously, and in an efficient manner.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of March 28, entitled "Penny Pinching." It summarizes very well the main thesis of my remarks this afternoon.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNY PINCHING

The saving of money is not necessarily economy. When it is accomplished at the expense of vital and valuable services, it may prove very uneconomical indeed. Need is a relative thing, of course, and the importance of desirable services must be weighed against the importance of tax reduction and budget balancing. We can call to mind at least two Federal undertakings now threatened with extinction in order to save money, the abandonment of which, in our judgment, would be plain penny-wise foolishness.

One of these is the school-lunch program. This involved, for the fiscal year 1946-47 less than one-fifth of 1 percent of the Federal Budget—actually about \$75,000,000. The program will come to an end on March 31 unless a deficiency appropriation is provided to carry it on. The money that will be saved by withholding an appropriation will be paid for in the health of some 5,000,000 school children now benefiting from nutritious lunches furnished at their schools through intelligent Federal-State-local cooperation. In a good many cases, these lunches have meant the difference between physical well-being and malnutrition. It would be an exceedingly myopic economy to cut off this sound investment in the health of the country's school children 3 months before the school year ends.

It seems to us that there is equally shortsighted penny pinching in the proposal to liquidate the Division of Labor Standards by excising from the Labor Department's appropriation the \$800,000 needed for the Division's work. Here is a modest Federal agency functioning in close cooperation with State agencies, helping them to develop sound administrative standards and to keep work places safe and healthy. Along with State labor departments, it works with management and labor to reduce industrial accidents, to minimize the evils of child labor, and to encourage peaceful and productive collective-bargaining procedures by training representatives of both sides. The cost of carrying on this Division is far less than the cost of industrial accidents and strikes which its activities prevent. Economizers would do well to remember the shoe that was lost for want of a nail, the horse that was lost for want of a shoe.

Mr. MORSE. I close by saying to my Republican colleagues in the Congress that I hope they will not be guilty of penny pinching in the name of economy.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a little more than 2 years ago, on February 26, 1945, I addressed the Senate on the subject of our foreign policy. I quote a few words from that address. At that time I said:

A great portion of the membership of this body, and I believe an equally great portion of the American people, are viewing with increasing misgivings the foreign policy which is being followed by the American Government. Many of us suspect that the Government has no policy at all and is simply floundering in a gigantic maelstrom of events which is forcing our hand everywhere and making our policy for us.

It is my hope that this estimate is an incorrect one and that it will be proven, despite the disturbing circumstances with which we are now acquainted, that the Government of the United States does indeed have long-range goals and clearly defined views as to how these may be attained.

I then went on to make some comparisons between the actual results of our appeasement policies toward Russia contrasted with the sanctimonious words of our many official declarations of policy beginning with the Atlantic Charter.

It may be that the President's address of recent date and the measure now before us are in the nature of an answer to my call for a definite policy with long-range goals and concrete measures to reach them. One paragraph from the President's speech of March 12 has been widely proclaimed as a new "Truman doctrine," which now at least provides us with a firm principle on which to stand. On that day the President said:

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

He then went on to say that our help should be extended through economic and financial means.

It is certainly worth our while to inquire carefully into the implications of this so-called Truman doctrine. It has been referred to as a new departure. What specifically are the new elements about it?

We have already committed ourselves, by joining the United Nations, to creating a system which would guarantee the security of all nations against "attempted subjugation," subject to our own use of the veto, of course. Adherence to that Charter was agreed to by an almost unanimous vote of this body. As practical men, I am sure we realized, at the time we accepted the UN Charter, that the United States would have to play the leading role since we are the strongest military power on earth.

I will assume that when we made that agreement we meant what we said. We pledged ourselves to support action in defense of sovereign nations threatened with aggression. In my speech of 2 years ago, to which I have referred, I also said:

I am satisfied that the world cannot safely return to the old business of power politics or to the old isolationism in any guise. There is, therefore, nothing new about our supporting free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation.

Those elements of the Truman doctrine which are new can be summed up in two sentences. First, we propose to bypass the United Nations, disown the cooperative organization through which we have been working to date, and accept for ourselves the entire burden for remaking the world. I shall have more to say about that in a moment. Second, the Truman doctrine proposes, for the first time, that we should adopt a permanent policy of spending hundreds of millions, perhaps billions, of dollars of American money in this world-wide crusade.

It has been said that the money involved in this bill is small compared with the costs of the war or the costs of our other activities in the international field. I am well aware of the fact that we have spent billions of dollars for lend-lease and billions of dollars for UNRRA and

other forms of relief. I am also acutely aware of the fact that we have lent abroad billions of dollars through sale of surplus property and surplus ships, through the continuation of peacetime lend-lease, through the British loan, through the Export-Import Bank, and through other channels. I am aware that we have committed ourselves to the loan of billions more through operations of the International Bank and Fund. But all of these operations, Mr. President, were in fulfillment of either wartime necessities or urgent relief needs or else were supposed to be self-supporting, reimbursable propositions. They were supposed to be temporary. We had hoped that this spending—at least that part of it which is not to be repaid—would come to an end with the end of the war, or with the end of the need for relief. Now we find that the spending is to go on and on, as a permanent fixture on the American scene, without even any real hope of repayment. Let me point out that there is not one cent for relief in this bill.

This bill is a return to the basic philosophy of the New Deal—that the way to meet any problem is to spend Government money. A few years ago, it was first seriously proposed that America should undertake to raise the standard of living of the rest of the world up to our own level. The idea was laughed out of court at that time. "A quart of milk for every Hottentot" became a standing joke. It is now apparent that that idea has been revived in a serious way as a basic part of our national foreign policy, but with new arguments behind it. Immediately following the President's speech, the press of the Nation began to fill with new proposals for spending abroad. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations came through with an idea for building hydroelectric plants—little TVA's—all over Greece. A columnist pointed out the tremendous increase in the production of food which could be attained by investment of \$100,000,000 of American money in reclaiming the deserts of Iraq. A serious magazine article in a responsible periodical began to talk of the need for spending millions and billions of American dollars in such widely separated places as the Philippines and Italy. All this was to be done in the name of a crusade against communism.

On numerous occasions in the past I have spoken out in favor of a strong stand against further Communist expansion. I opposed the decision at Teheran, and I opposed the Yalta agreement. If our administration has really determined to stand firmly against further Communist aggression, I will gladly support it. But I am not yet completely convinced that the only way to fight communism is to pour more billions of American dollars out of our unbalanced budget.

I recall that only a few months ago the nation of Iran was in grave danger from Russia. Russian troops in large numbers were actually inside the country. I recall that we found it possible, working by diplomatic measures through the United Nations, to put a halt to that aggression. The Government of Iran was

subsequently able to establish its sovereign authority firmly over every part of its own nation. If the United Nations was good enough to save Iran, why cannot it save Turkey? Is Turkey now in greater danger than Iran was at that time? Is Greece in greater danger? At that time subversive and foreign elements actually controlled a large part of the territory of Iran. Frankly, I do not believe we have fully explored the potentialities of the United Nations.

The State Department has made a case that the United Nations is not yet strong enough to guarantee the security of Greece. At the same time, they have given us no indication as to how soon the United Nations may be expected to acquire the necessary strength. We have been told that our foreign policy is based on adherence to the principles of the United Nations. If the United Nations is not strong enough to work, we had better change it to make it work.

We return to the fact that the proposal is a typical New Deal method of approaching any problem. In other words, it involves spending gigantic sums of money. It is not yet clear to me, however, whether we have arrived at the clear-cut definite foreign policy we need. Our measures of economic assistance to strengthen democracy in Greece and Turkey are still being balanced by measures of economic assistance to strengthen communism in Russia and her satellites. The same State Department which is sponsoring this program is simultaneously trying to extract \$25,000,000 from the Congress to settle up accounts on an old and rather shady deal with Russia involving final settlement of the lend-lease operation. We are still planning to send thousands of tons of potatoes as a gift to Stalin's leading puppet, Marshal Tito, in Yugoslavia. Meanwhile, two other puppets, Poland and Czechoslovakia, are negotiating for loans of good American dollars from the World Bank, while Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, members of the International Monetary Fund, are no doubt preparing at the present moment to draw down their quotas of our money in that institution.

It may be that our new-style diplomats have become so lost in the jungle of their own financial creations that they have forgotten that all this money comes eventually from the American taxpayer.

The whole matter boils down to this: We are staging the world's biggest prize fight and financing both sides. This proposal is of the same pattern of financial irresponsibility with all the rest of the New Deal from beginning to end.

Mr. President, the American people have voted for an end to financial irresponsibility and for a reduction in taxes. They gave us a mandate to reject the spending philosophy of the last 14 years. They did so, I believe, because they had come to realize fully that Government spending must come from taxes paid by the people—not merely a small proportion of the people, namely the rich, but by all the people. More than half our revenue from the individual income tax comes from persons making less than \$5,000 a year. At the present time we

in the Finance Committee are studying various proposals for tax reduction, and trying to determine what tax relief we can grant to our people. It has been hoped that we could increase the individual exemption by \$500. Mr. President, we cannot afford to do that. Such an action would more than wipe out the entire surplus we hope to obtain. We must continue to tax not only the average man, but the poor man, to support this spending. We must continue to tax the married man making only \$25 a week. It is not the rich who will pay the cost of this enterprise; it is the poor.

Mr. President, I have hopes that before this measure is brought to a final vote it will be substantially amended on the floor of the Senate. The proposal may have within it at least the seeds of a sound foreign policy. In my judgment, however, much more is needed to construct that policy than the ideas that have been presented to us. I should like to mention a few of the elementary facts which have been almost ignored in this controversy.

First of all is the absolute necessity of maintaining unimpaired the financial strength of the United States. This world today would be a place of chaos if our Nation had suffered from the inflation, radicalism, and destruction that have beset almost every other nation in the world. The mere existence of the United States as a strong, solvent, going concern is the greatest element of stability left on this earth. If we sacrifice that stability in foolish, wasteful adventures abroad that bring us no return, we shall have done the world no service at all. Communism will be defeated if we keep faith in our own system. Let us not permit that system to be wrecked on what President Roosevelt once called "the rocks of a loose fiscal policy."

A mere glance at the problems of some other countries which may even now be lining up at the State Department to share in the American largess should make us consider carefully what we are doing. Take China, for example. Conditions in China, both economic and political, are probably even worse than in Greece. Inflation has run to an even greater extent. The Communists actually control a substantial part of China's territory. China's population is roughly 60 times that of Greece. Whether China would require financial assistance 60 times as great as is proposed for Greece would be hard to say, but certainly her needs are vastly greater. We are proposing to spend \$275,000,000 on Greece as a first installment. If China's per capita needs are as great, the cost there would run between fifteen and twenty billions.

Or take India, for example, which seems to be rapidly descending into chaos. India's population is nearly as great as China's. Her standard of living is probably the lowest in the world. The tensions and antagonisms among her population appear to be as great as in any other country on earth. What would it cost to sustain democratic forces in India?

Mr. President, out in the West it used to be a common practice among ranch-

ers and farmers to offer a bounty for the destruction of predatory animals, such as wolves and coyotes. The bounty would usually be paid upon presentation of the scalp or pelt, and the total cost depended on how many pelts were turned in. This scheme was moderately successful in some cases, but it ran into great difficulties with the perversities of human nature. Too many men figured that it would be most profitable to kill the wolf cubs for the bounty, but to leave the parent wolves alive, so that there would be more cubs and more bounties later.

I wonder if we may not have the same problem with the bounty we are offering on Communists. Communists can be found, to at least some slight extent, in practically every country in the world. In many devastated countries around the world raising a domestic Communist menace may become one of the most profitable enterprises that such countries could engage in, judging by the example of Greece. It will obviously be practical for each small country to preserve and protect its own small Communist group, not large enough to be a serious menace, but large enough to draw American dollars. I suspect that as soon as we have passed this bill, we shall suddenly find that communism is a tremendous danger in many other countries of the world. We shall have country after country trotting out its Communist menace for our inspection, and we shall be told that only American dollars can save democracy in each case. No doubt before we are through we shall be subsidizing Franco in Spain.

I suggest that we should not take this first step until we have some idea of the ultimate cost of the whole program and an opportunity to measure the effect of a continued tax load on the poor of our own United States. Remember that poor, ordinary, hard-working Americans are paying half the total tax collected here.

Mr. President, a few days ago the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] publicly urged that Mr. Bernard M. Baruch be appointed to conduct a survey of our national assets and obligations. More than a year ago an almost identical proposal was made in the Senate. At that time, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], in an address to the Senate, called for an official statement of all the relevant information regarding our financial transactions with other nations, together with a statement of our current financial situation, both internationally and internally, all the facts to be brought together into one convenient summary, so that they could be considered and studied together, and their significance and relationships clearly understood. At that time, on his own behalf and on behalf of a number of other Senators, he submitted Senate Resolution 231 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, requesting such a study. That Senate resolution was referred to committee, where it slumbered peacefully until the end of the session. Long before that, similar information had been requested by such distinguished figures as Mr. Bernard Baruch, without any more success. We still do not have a picture of our over-all position, of our financial

resources, and of our obligations. Until we have such a picture, I cannot see how we can intelligently embark on this vast new international spending program. At this time, therefore, I am resubmitting, for study by the Senate Finance Committee, Senate Resolution 231 of the last Congress, with certain minor changes made necessary by the passage of events.

I am impressed with the fact that every area of the world we touch suddenly becomes a major drain on the American taxpayer. Under Hitler, they were all at least self-supporting. For that matter, when the Russians move into a country, they do not find it necessary to lend it assistance—quite the contrary. Only Americans manage to discover that every country they enter is a liability and must be subsidized.

It may be that relief was and is an urgent necessity in certain countries, but there seems to be no time limit over which this assistance must be extended. We are now told that western Germany is in worse shape than when we first arrived, and that it will be several years before it can become self-supporting. Korea, Italy, Japan, and other countries still will be in desperate need of assistance during the third year of peace. There seems to be no end to the process.

If we are ever to get the world back on its feet, we must recognize that the only answer in these devastated areas is a new emphasis on production out of their own resources, slender though they may be. This may seem a harsh prescription. It is not more harsh than the facts justify. It is, in fact, the only path to salvation. American money cannot continue to flow forever. In fact, we already have proof that American money alone cannot do the job. It is time to quit relying primarily on American loans and gifts.

I would suggest therefore that our responsible officials start to make it clear that the salvation of Greece is largely in the hands of the Greeks, not in our hands. I have yet to see any coherent plan explaining concretely what contribution the Greeks expect to effect to their own reconstruction. Inflation in Greece has been raging for many months. Concretely, what internal measures does Greece expect to take to put an end to it? We are told that much of the revenues of the Greek Government goes into political graft for Greek officials or is dissipated in unnecessary expenditures among favored groups. What plans have been formulated to put a stop to that? We are told that Greek capital has fled the country or is in hiding. Has the present regime in Greece devised any plans for inducing this capital to invest in productive enterprise at home? Exports of Greek products, such as tobacco, are apparently held back by high prices caused by inflation and other factors. Greece will never recover until she restores her exports to prewar levels. What plans have been made to facilitate the marketing of such products as Greece may have for sale?

These questions should be answered before we advance this money, not afterwards. We cannot afford to extend aid unless there is some evidence that the

money will be used to bring about recovery. The situation in Greece will not be cured solely by American dollars. It can be cured only by restoring production in Greece of the items of commerce.

Mr. President, we have already poured out immense sums of money all through the world, through lend-lease, through UNRRA, through an extension of lend-lease into peacetime, through sale of our war surpluses, through sale of our surplus ships, through the British loan, through the International Bank, through the International Fund, through relief in the countries we have occupied, and through many other channels. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] yesterday inserted in the Record some revealing figures showing the tremendous extent of the aid we have already given to the rest of the world. We are now told that these contributions are not enough. We are told that now almost 2 years after the end of the war in Europe that we must embark on a new spending campaign to protect the world from communism. If this is to be our policy, I only ask that we keep two fundamental facts in mind: First, we must not destroy our own solvency; and second, we must insist that our money be put to better use than it has been in the past. Certainly the results we have obtained with the money we have spent to date have not been encouraging.

Mr. President, I do not wish to be understood as being unfriendly to the people of Greece or to the people of any other needy area. Where American aid can relieve a situation on the basis of relief, I, for one, am willing to give all that I personally can afford to give, just as most of the American people have done in the past. But I wish to have the giving done, not on a Government level, but voluntarily through organizations such as the American Red Cross which the American people have supported very well during years past, and will continue to support. The drive of the American Red Cross in the ordinary community in the United States is an annual event in which practically everyone in the community takes part.

All of us have faith in the statement that "it is more blessed to give than to receive." I was reminded very definitely of the truth of that statement during the trip around the world which I took last summer. We stopped in Shanghai, and were there several days. From a vantage viewpoint I looked out over the harbor filled with ships, one of them a magnificent American battleship. Most of the ships were UNRRA ships, supposedly still loaded with UNRRA material. The admiral in charge of the battleship told me that when the ships finally reached the docks to be unloaded it was discovered that a large portion of the material, if not all of it, had already been taken from the ships. Where had it gone, Mr. President? I do not believe anyone knows officially as yet. At least there has been no public statement regarding it. Within 2 or 3 weeks of that time—in fact, I think it was a shorter period than that—relief material going to China by the UNRRA route was stopped because of poor administrative handling. I doubt that the flow of UNRRA material to China has even been started again.

That is an indication of what giving does to a people when it is done on a government level. America has performed a wonderful service to the great nation of China through past decades, but that service has been rendered through organizations made up of individuals who gave because they wished to support a work of that kind. If today the American people are to be sold the idea of furnishing relief to Greece and to any other country which really needs aid—and I think undoubtedly the Greeks are in great need of aid of certain kinds—it should be aid properly given through individual channels, not on the government level. Such aid, properly distributed and properly administered over there, will do more to stop communism than anything we can do on a governmental level.

Mr. President, I now submit the resolution and request that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 103) submitted by Mr. BUTLER was received and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas the United States Government has already extended financial and economic aid to certain foreign countries and to international organizations to a total of billions of dollars; and

Whereas our Government is committed to additional aid on a large scale; and

Whereas additional commitments and requests for assistance are constantly rumored; and

Whereas Congress is lacking information as to the current and probable future total of such requests and commitments; and

Whereas the question has been raised as to the ability of the United States to meet all the demands arising from existing international commitments and from future requests from abroad for financial and economic assistance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President be, and is hereby, respectfully requested to direct the Bureau of the Budget, as promptly as possible, to report in detail—

1. The grand total of indebtedness on loans, investments, commitments, or other obligations outstanding as of December 31, 1946, of all foreign governments, their agencies, and their private citizens to the United States Government, its agencies, and its private citizens; and the same shown separately for public indebtedness and for private indebtedness.

2. The total loans made by the United States Government to foreign governments and agencies thereof from 1914 to 1932, inclusive, and from 1933 to the date hereof; itemized for each country, with the repayment history of each.

3. Existing commitments of the United States Government or representatives thereof, including alleged moral commitments, to extend American financial and economic aid to foreign countries and international organizations.

4. The amounts of American portfolio and direct investments abroad, by country, as of the end of 1914, 1932, 1939, and 1946.

5. The amount of foreign portfolio and direct investments in the United States, by country, at the end of 1914, 1932, 1939, and 1946.

6. Gold reserves, dollar balances, and other hard-money assets, as of the end of 1946, of countries whose governments are now in debt to the United States Government or with whom loan and investment discussions have been held by any American official since 1939.

7. The legal and actual status of American direct investments under the laws and cur-

rent practices of the respective foreign countries in which such investments have been made.

8. The value, classification, and location of United States Government-owned property in foreign countries to December 31, 1946, including installations and surplus property.

9. So far as possible, the total value of American goods exported and services performed for foreigners, excluding reexports and financial and security transfers, annually from 1914 to 1946; together with the corresponding items supplied by foreigners to the United States in the same period.

10. The effects of the war on the public debt of the United States.

11. The per capita tax burden of the people of the United States classified as (1) Federal, (2) State and local, and (3) total; and the total per capita tax burden of the people of each of the countries now in debt to the United States or with whom loan and investment discussions have been held by any American official since 1939.

12. The total per capita debt burden for each of the countries mentioned in item 11.

13. The latest reasonably reliable report on the national income, reduced to a per capita basis, for each of the countries mentioned in item 11.

14. The average interest rates for Government borrowing, according to the latest reasonably reliable report, in each of the countries mentioned in item 11.

15. An estimate year by year of the probable expenditures of foreign countries for American goods and services as a result of the loans, credits, grants, and other forms of financial aid, contracted with this country publicly or privately since VE-day.

16. Assuming the ultimate necessity of gold settlements under estimated total economic transactions (exclusive of extensions of American loans and credits) between foreign countries and the United States within the next 5 years, what gold is available for such settlements and how is it distributed so that nations likely to be liable for gold settlements to the United States will have the gold to make them?

17. What changes are necessary in this country's import tariffs to make possible the repayment of the loans and investment already made as contemplated by the United States and by private American interests; and be it further

Resolved, That immediately upon the receipt of the foregoing data and information from the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of the Senate shall cause the same to be printed and published as a Senate document in the number of 2,500 copies for the use of the Congress and the public.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 231. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.; and

S. 363. An act to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.)

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow, Friday, and Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent of the Senate is granted.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from

the Senate, leaving here Friday evening and returning about 1 week later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, such consent is granted.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of John Price Gregg, of Oregon, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1953, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported favorably the nomination of Col. Marshall Sylvester Carter (captain, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States, to be brigadier general, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me inquire what happened to the nomination under the general title of "Tennessee Valley Authority" and the nominations under the title "Atomic Energy Commission"? Those nominations should go over for the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the nominations for the Atomic Energy Commission are to be called for vote at 5 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the nomination under the heading "Tennessee Valley Authority" should likewise go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination under that heading will be passed over.

Mr. WHITE. I now ask unanimous consent that the nominations under the heading "Diplomatic and Foreign Service" be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WHITE. I also ask consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 4:50 o'clock today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate

took a recess until 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHITE obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to inquire of the able majority leader what the program for tomorrow will be.

Mr. WHITE. The program for tomorrow, Mr. President, as I understand it, will be the continued consideration of the Greek-Turkish loan bill. Let me express the hope that the consideration of that measure will be continuous until it is disposed of. I hope there will be no interruption of that program.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the majority leader advise me whether it is expected that the Senate will complete the consideration of that measure tomorrow, or whether it will take longer?

Mr. WHITE. It is hoped to complete consideration of that measure tomorrow, but it might take until Friday.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Ball	Hill	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saitonstall
Byrd	Kem	Smith
Cain	Kilgore	Sparkman
Capehart	Knowland	Stewart
Capper	Langer	Taft
Chavez	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eaton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Wherry
George	Maybank	White
Green	Millikin	Wiley
Gurney	Moore	Williams
Hawkes	Morse	Willson
	Murray	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WHERRY, and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." If the Senator from Washington were present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. TYDINGS (when Mr. OVERTON's name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. If the Senator from Louisiana were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, in the absence of this pair, I would vote "yea."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If the Senator from New York were present, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The previously mentioned Senators are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea." The Senator from West Virginia is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are absent by leave of the Senate to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the funeral of a close personal friend.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

I announce the following pairs on this vote:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], who would vote "nay";

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who would vote "yea," with the

Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who would vote "nay"; and

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who would vote "yea," with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—50

Aiken	Holland	O'Connor
Baldwin	Ives	O'Mahoney
Ball	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Capper	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Chavez	Kilgore	Saitonstall
Connally	Knowland	Smith
Donnell	Langer	Sparkman
Downey	Lodge	Taylor
Eastland	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
George	McGrath	Thye
Green	McMahon	Tobey
Gurney	Maybank	Umstead
Hayden	Millikin	Vandenberg
Hickenlooper	Morse	Watkins
Hill	Murray	Young
Hoey	Myers	

NAYS—31

Bricker	Dworshak	O'Daniel
Bridges	Eaton	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Flanders	Stewart
Buck	Hawkes	Taft
Bushfield	Jenner	Wherry
Butler	Kem	White
Byrd	McClellan	Wiley
Cain	McKellar	Williams
Capehart	Malone	Willson
Cooper	Martin	
Cordon	Moore	

NOT VOTING—14

Barkley	McCarran	Revercomb
Brewster	McCarthy	Russell
Ellender	Magnuson	Tydings
Ferguson	Overtton	Wagner
Hatch	Reed	

So the nomination of David E. Lilienthal was confirmed.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair admonishes the occupants of the galleries that demonstrations of any kind are contrary to the rules of the Senate.

The remaining nominations to the Atomic Energy Commission will be stated in order.

ROBERT F. BACHER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert F. Bacher, of New York, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

SUMNER T. PIKE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sumner T. Pike, of Maine, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEWIS L. STRAUSS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss, of Virginia, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

WILLIAM W. WAYMACK

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William W. Waymack, of Iowa, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the term expiring August 1, 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

CARROLL L. WILSON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carroll L. Wilson, of Massachusetts, to be General Manager within the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the action of the Senate in confirming these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 10, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 9 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

John Price Gregg, of Oregon, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1953. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 9 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

GENERAL MANAGER WITHIN THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Carroll L. Wilson.

MEMBERS OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION FOR TERMS EXPIRING AUGUST 1, 1948

David E. Lillenthal	Lewis L. Strauss
Robert F. Bacher	William W. Waymack
Sumner T. Pike	

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMEMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COUNTRIES NAMED

Willard L. Beaulac, to Colombia.
Walter J. Donnelly, to Costa Rica.
John F. Simmons, to Ecuador.
Albert F. Nufer, to El Salvador.
Paul C. Daniels, to Honduras.
Henry F. Grady, to India.
Fletcher Warren, to Paraguay.
John C. Wiley, to Portugal.
Edwin F. Stanton, to Siam.
Williamson S. Howell, Jr., to Uruguay.
Cavendish W. Cannon, to Yugoslavia.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COUNTRIES NAMED

Selden Chapin, to Hungary.
George A. Garrett, to Ireland.
Paul H. Alling, to the Republic of Syria.

CONSUL GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Cecil Wayne Gray

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Elmer H. Bourgerie
George A. Morgan
W. Leonard Parker

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4, CONSULS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

James D. Bell	Harold H. Rhodes
Frank P. Butler	Roy Richard Rubot-ton, Jr.
Nat B. King	

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 5, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

David M. Bane
William G. Gibson

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Theo C. Adams	John I. Fishburne
Slator C. Blackiston, Jr.	John E. MacDonald
William B. Connnett, Jr.	Gilbert L. Newbold
	John B. Young

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we draw near to Thee with thanksgiving and praise for all Thy unnumbered mercies. Thy blessings roll on and on forever, giving strength for every weakness, rest for every sorrow, and hope for every wanderer on this mortal sphere.

O Thou deliverer, while we see Thee not, yet we trust and pray that Thou wilt help all who struggle with jealousy, all who struggle with avarice, and all who struggle against doubt and fear. O direct those who know not how to minister unto their perplexities, lingering on the stepping stones of self; but enable us to mount to higher levels of patience, knowing that with Thee "a thousand years in Thy sight are as yesterday when they are past." We rejoice that the day will come when we shall rebound from the limitations of earth and behold our full stature in the light of a good God, and Thine shall be the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 7, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the

House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2102. An act to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 350. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1948; and

S. 715. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service.

SENATE MESSAGE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

APRIL 8, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to on April 2, 1947, the Clerk received today from the Secretary of the Senate a message attesting to the passage of the following bills:

Senate bills:

S. 64. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Dan River in North Carolina;

S. 241. An act for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo;

S. 243. An act for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine;

S. 254. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey;

S. 425. An act for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd;

S. 516. An act to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes;

S. 723. An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate;

S. 814. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; and

S. 1005. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Inter-parliamentary Union."

House bills without amendment:

H. R. 1327. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period;

H. R. 1621. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports;

H. R. 1713. An act to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1943. An act to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.

House bill amended:

H. R. 731. An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on April 8, 1947, examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1327. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period;

H. R. 1621. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports;

H. R. 1713. An act to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1943. An act to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on April 2, 1947, he did, on April 8, 1947, sign the following enrolled bills:

H. R. 1327. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period;

H. R. 1621. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports;

H. R. 1713. An act to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1943. An act to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 12 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include

a letter addressed to the New York Times.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes, and that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HENDRICKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

HENRY FORD

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the master of mass production left this world last Monday night. Henry Ford passed away peacefully in his Dearborn, Mich., home.

He was one of the world's great men and the world is better because he lived. He was a benefactor of mankind. Simplicity was the keystone of his life.

Born of humble parents, and with meager education, he rose from obscurity to build the greatest industrial empire of his time. It began in an alley barn. It began with bolting a piece of water pipe and flywheel to the kitchen sink. It began with Mrs. Ford holding a lantern over her husband's experiments, which later revolutionized world transportation.

The poor man should never forget him. He provided transportation for him at a cost within his reach. The laboring man should never forget him. He doubled his wages voluntarily.

Henry Ford and his family have been manufacturing cars, not because they needed bread but to provide employment for those who needed it.

Our State of Michigan has lost its most distinguished son, and the world has lost one of its greatest men.

FLORIDA

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, on various occasions I have invited the individual Members of this House and the House en masse to come to Florida. Many of you have availed yourselves of that opportunity, and I am glad that they have had the pleasure of going down. Others have found themselves so busy that they could not go.

Now, for some of you people who have not been to Florida, may I tell you that on tomorrow night *The Yearling*, based on a Pulitzer-prize-winning play by Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings, is opening at the Palace Theater, and in view of the fact that some of you have never been to Florida, I invite you to go down and see a part of Florida, and visualize the beauty of that great State.

Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings was born in Washington, D. C., and lived here and on her father's farm on Rock Creek, near Garrett Park, Md., for 18 years. In 1928 she bought her orange grove in north-central Florida with her inheritance which represented half of the Maryland farm. She felt that she had come home again.

She had been a writer literally all her life, her first commercial sale being to the children's page of the *Washington Post* at the age of 11. Her remuneration was \$2, and she reports that the movie sale of *The Yearling* did not seem nearly as important.

Her first 10 years on her mortgaged orange grove were years of struggle and poverty, for the "golden apples" do not infallibly place an orange grower in the 75 percent income tax bracket. During those years she lived intimately as one of the Florida rural folk, loved them, studied their Shakespearean speech, listened to their tales of hunting, fishing, and of nature lore. She wrote of the Florida backwoods country, and of the people, in two books and many stories.

The story of *The Yearling* can be traced directly to her close relationship with her father, and to the love of nature he taught her on the Maryland farms. For its background, she used the Big Scrub section of Florida, wild, lonely, still sparsely inhabited, where the battle for existence is only more difficult than in her native city of Washington, D. C. The boy Jody in the tale is derived, she says, from the memories of two old men. She hunted, fished and camped with them, relived with them their early and exciting lives, and the little boy, doomed by tragedy to early maturity, took shape before her eyes. She used a true locale for the story, and the Baxter clearing in the Florida Scrub still stands, desolate and beautiful.

Mrs. Rawlings has seen the film of *The Yearling*, and is gratified that the country, the life, the people, have come to life with complete faithfulness. *Time Magazine* complained that in the picture the Florida skies were "Too breathtakingly blue," the "piercing green palm fronds arranged in composed landscapes," the "dusty good earth downright gorgeous."

She answered simply, "But it is true." I want you people to go down and see some of beautiful Florida.

ADDRESS BY MR. GAEL SULLIVAN

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, at the Jefferson day dinner last Saturday night

a speech was delivered by a gentleman whom I have known from his youth and who is now very active in the interest of our country, Mr. Gael Sullivan. It is an outstanding speech, one that I believe every man interested in the welfare of our Nation should read. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include that address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MAINE TOWNSHIP, ILL.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, today in Washington we have the pleasure of being host to students of various high schools and colleges throughout the Nation. Among those students are approximately 50 from Maine Township, Ill.

Maine Township is located in the northwest section of Cook County, in the heart of the Seventh Congressional District, which I have the pleasure and honor to represent. The Seventh Congressional District, as you know, is the largest in population in the United States, with over 1,000,000 people living within its borders at the present time. Maine Township is a fine farming and industrial community, with two very beautiful cities, Park Ridge and Des Plaines.

I like to think about Maine Township especially since my mother lives in Park Ridge. We in Washington greet our visitors who are going to be the leaders of tomorrow and trust that they will enjoy their visit and that their vision will be enlightened by their contacts in the National Capital, and that they will be more prepared to meet the important duties of tomorrow.

VETERANS' ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have this day filed a petition for discharge—No. 4—on the Speaker's desk to bring to the floor of the House H. R. 246, a bill to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job and for other purposes.

I have placed the discharge petition on the Speaker's desk for the reason that H. R. 246 was reported out of the Veterans' Affairs Committee by a unanimous vote on February 26, 1947, after having been carefully considered by the full committee in several hearings. Under the rules of the House, House Resolution 159 was filed on March 21, 1947, and seven legislative days having elapsed

without consideration of the bill by the Rules Committee, I now offer the membership of the House the opportunity to sign the petition for discharge, thereby dispensing with further consideration of the bill by the Committee on Rules.

It will be remembered by the membership that during the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress a bill was passed, known as Public Law 679, placing ceilings in on-the-job training at \$175 for single veterans and \$200 for veterans with dependents. H. R. 246 provides that the ceilings for veterans undergoing training under this law shall be increased to \$250 per month for a veteran without a dependent, \$325 per month for a veteran with one dependent, or \$350 per month for a veteran with two or more dependents.

I invite and urge my colleagues to sign this petition in order that a great injustice to veterans be righted.

SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 97) limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, section 365, or section 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel to the special committee of the Senate serving under the provisions of Senate Resolution 46, Eightieth Congress, first session, adopted January 22, 1947.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this just applies to the Senate committee?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. It is applicable to the Senate committee operating under Senate Resolution 46 of the Eightieth Congress, which as I understand is the so-called War Investigating Committee. The resolution was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and a similar resolution (H. J. Res. 165) has been introduced in the House by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], who is very eager to have the matter disposed of, and so communicated to me. It refers only to the operation of the Senate committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the resolution which the gentleman from Indiana spoke to me about?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; it is.

Mr. SABATH. I think he is a good man for that purpose, and I think the resolution should be adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address made by him last night over the American Broadcasting Co. on the subject of communism.

STOPPING COMMUNISM IN AMERICA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Un-American Activities this morning cited for contempt of Congress Eugene Dennis, national secretary of the Communist Party. We also recommended to the Attorney General that he be prosecuted for conspiracy to incite contempt.

During the testimony this morning, among other things, it was revealed that Mr. Eugene Dennis secured a fraudulent passport under the name of Paul Walsh. This is one additional link in the long series of fraudulent passports which the Communists of this country have obtained, including Browder, Eisler, Josephson, Weiner, and many others.

I have today introduced a bill, Mr. Speaker, which would put an end to this kind of fraudulent passport racket by requiring finger printing as a part of the process of securing a passport. It also extends the statute of limitations for the prosecution of passport cases.

May I add, however, that in the meantime I recommend that President Truman issue an Executive order stopping the issuance of passports to American Communists. We have had American Communists creeping all over Europe of late on official passports issued by the American State Department. In fact, W. Z. Foster, chairman of the American Communist Party, is now conferring with European Communists with the aid of an American passport. The State Department does not have to issue these passports. The President can stop it today if he wants to. I call upon him now to exercise his authority to do so.

If we are serious about this business of stopping communism, let us curtail its effectiveness in America by an Executive order by the President on this important matter now. There is no need to wait for legislation. By this action the President can curb Communist influence and conspiracy without waiting for his loyalty purge to be made effective. By this action the President can decrease Communist effectiveness without sending soldiers to the Balkans or

spending \$400,000,000 in Greece and Turkey. Mr. Speaker, it is time America got serious and became consistent in this matter of communism. While trying to stop its aggressive march abroad, let us at least have an Executive order from the President which will deny further passports to American Communists who go overseas to aid and abet the cause of the aggressors we are now being called upon to stop.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article from the American magazine on labor.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ON GOVERNMENT SEIZURE OF STRUCK UTILITIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the current telephone stoppage illustrates again what should already have been amply clear from the railroad and coal general strikes—that at the basic and justifiable fear of the country is labor strife resulting in national paralysis. Therefore, if the Congress is to legislate on labor in the national interest it must first lay at rest this fear by passing a bill for seizure of any plant, mine, or facility by the Government, the immobilization of which threatens to paralyze the national economy. This done, we can consider other labor legislation to deal with collective bargaining, union democracy, and union responsibility without trading on this overriding fear of national shut-downs. A Government-seizure bill must provide only for that minimal operation by Government essential to the public health and safety. Compensation to owners should be limited to the use value of the enterprise taken over as shut down, and not of the going concern. We must have plans and skeleton staffs for direction of properties so taken over in the appropriate Government departments, or in a department, just as we have staffs for industrial mobilization in the War and Navy Departments. The injunction bills now being talked about say they do not propose to make any employee work against his will, but they propose nothing less than that. Government seizure and emergency operation promise results, not punishment or Government strikebreaking.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. Wolcott addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

Mr. NORMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and include two speeches.

Mr. REEVES (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Kansas City Star.

FISCAL AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia may sit this afternoon notwithstanding the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LOAN TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps the farmer is the strongest fiber in the web and woof of our economy. He is hard working. He is independent. Perhaps he is a little more American than some of the rest of us because he is nearer the soil and therefore nearer to nature.

The farmers in my district take a keen and intelligent interest in politics, particularly during the winter months when their work is less arduous. Since one of their greatest problems is paying off their mortgages and keeping out of unnecessary debt, it is difficult for them to understand a Federal Government, the objective of which seems to have been to get into more and more debt. I asked one of those farmers what he thought about the President's proposal with regard to Greece and Turkey. He said he was perfectly willing to give something to feed hungry people, but he said we could not give them everything; they will have to do something for themselves. He said, "As for messing in with military affairs, I am against it."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

NAVY DEPARTMENT PICKETED BY ILWU LOCAL 10 OF SAN FRANCISCO WITH BANNERS READING "THIS ESTABLISHMENT IS UNFAIR TO LABOR"

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, prior to the war the loading and unloading of Navy ammunition at Mare Island or Port Chicago was handled by civil-service workers, specially trained for the job. During war and immediately following, so much ammunition was handled that regular employees were unable to take care of all of it. The Navy then hired, through the longshoreman's union, some temporary employees to handle this work.

Recently a ship was unloaded at Port Chicago by regular employees. Immediately the union threw a picket line at the United States naval magazine at Port Chicago, Calif., carrying banners reading "This establishment unfair to labor."

One of the regular workmen sent me a very interesting and shocking letter, which I am including in these remarks, telling about the incident. Incidentally, by using the regular employees, all of whom have been certified by the Civil Service Commission, the saving to the Government on one shipload was \$58,000.

This situation is food for thought because here is a private organization picketing the Navy and calling the Navy unfair for handling its work with regular employees selected pursuant to law. In other words, a union is proposing to tell the Navy who they shall hire to unload ammunition, even though by statute the workmen for this job and other Navy work have been provided for and are entirely satisfactory to the Navy.

This is the letter:

UNITED STATES NAVAL MAGAZINE,
Port Chicago, Calif., April 1, 1947.
Hon. LEROY JOHNSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I ask you to come and see for yourself the unbelievable. Picketers patrolling the streets at this station carrying banners, "This establishment unfair to labor." Can any governmental instrumentality be unfair to labor while following the laws of Congress and rules and regulations of civil service?

The picketers in this case are members of the ILWU, Local 10, of San Francisco. Mr. Bulcke, president of this union, has made attacks on the integrity of civil service by calling civil-service workers incompetent. He has, or at least has countenanced the publication of the statement that members of unions employed at this station have been discharged simply because of union affiliations. It goes without saying these statements are utterly untrue and unfounded. In the first instance, all workers used on this station must meet the minimum requirements for their particular jobs as prescribed by the Civil Service Commission. In the second instance, all hands on this station are well aware of the fact that they may continue their particular union affiliations, and are doing so.

Unfortunately, the civil-service workers as a group cannot go out and fight the statements made by this CIO union as a privately employed group might. Who is going to represent us? Our station commanding officer, Capt. John B. Taylor, is doing all he can do officially, but he cannot run paid advertisements in the papers, and we as civil employees cannot band together and raise

funds to tell our side of the story. Solicitation of funds for other than specific purposes is prohibited by the Navy Civilian Personnel Instructions.

Your support as a civil-service employee is requested in this matter. Are you going to stand by and allow the CIO union to drive home the entering wedge on a union shop for civil service? Worse still to think about is the opening gun for a closed-shop drive.

I write to you, for while employed at Mare Island as a foreman I received letters from you that proved to me your great interest in the civil-service system and employee.

THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in a broadcast made over the Mutual Network the morning of April 8, 1947, commentator George Reedy, a veteran Washington correspondent, made the following observations of the importance of the small businessman in our American economy. I quote:

The large, black, screaming headlines of the day have led many to believe that this is the country of big business. Every paper that we pick up tells us of the blistering fights between huge corporations and huge unions.

In the middle of all this storm and fury, we have tended to forget that this country is based on the small businessman, the American who has a few dollars and is willing to take a few chances. Today his plight often seems to be desperate.

The small businessman, with the end of the war, was caught in a maze of conflicting economic forces. And in the sweep of reconversion from war to peace, he has almost been forgotten. The public eye has been caught by problems of a greater magnitude.

To find out just what his problems are, committees have been set up in both the House and the Senate. These groups are charged with the special duty of helping the small businessman keep his head above the economic waters.

Despite the importance of their work neither committee has had very much publicity. So, in an attempt to learn how they work, I visited the chairman of the House group yesterday.

He is WALTER C. PLOESER, a Missouri Republican, who believes that a flourishing small business is necessary to maintain the liberties of a country. On that theory he is bending every effort to give the little man a break. He has already accomplished a lot. He plans to do much more.

His first problem, paradoxical as it may sound, is to find out just what the problem is. In other words, just what are the needs of small business and how can they best be met. Without the answer to these questions action can only be taken blindly.

It is obvious, of course, that a principal issue is the effect of wartime economic controls over the Nation's small business. Possibly an even more difficult question is the effect of the relaxation of those controls. The committee will cover these subjects intensively.

In many cases the problem of small business is the problem of adequate financing. Even the veteran, with the many benefits guaranteed him by the Government, finds it hard to scrape up the necessary money to get started.

A surprising fact is that a large number of the Nation's 500,000 small businesses are less

than 5 years old. The mortality rate has not been high yet. But the prospects for the future are not altogether encouraging.

The purpose of the committee is to make those prospects encouraging. And with any sort of cooperation from his fellow legislators, Mr. PLOESER hopes to be successful. To put it in his own words, he says:

"The committee will endeavor to correct our free, competitive enterprise system so thoroughly that never again will we as a nation be tempted to compromise it with alien theories of dictatorship, monopoly, wasteful spending, and fiscal dishonesty."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Brookville American.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a talk given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by George S. Benson, president of Harding College.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, Thursday, April 10, after the disposition of the business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes today after the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HENRY FORD

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Massachusetts has a special interest and a special regret at the passing of Mr. Henry Ford. He bought the historical Wayside Inn at Sudbury which used to be in my district. He was tremendously interested in all the old traditions of the country. He was interested in art in all its forms. The Ford Sunday symphony orchestra is heard by millions. Much has been said about his interest in industry, his contribution to industry. I doubt if so much has been said about his contribution to agriculture. He had some of the finest cattle in the United States. He made splendid contributions to agriculture, and the agricultural fairs in Massachusetts were very proud when he sent his famous pair of oxen.

Those of us whose first ride in an automobile was in a model T Ford and who owned one will never forget that car or the man who made it possible for us to see the country and the world.

All that could pass physically of Mr. Henry Ford is gone, but what he has done for the country will live on.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

REPUBLICAN ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Hannon-Sullivan high command, aided and abetted by a few so-called newspaper columnists and commentators, continue to snipe at the Republican program and are still using the smoke emerging from the dying, smoldering New Deal fire which the people put out very effectively last November to cloud the issues and attempt to confuse and mislead the people concerning the accomplishments of the House of Representatives during the first 90 days of the new Congress.

Mr. Frank C. Waldrop, writing in the Washington Times-Herald under date of April 8, makes a very able summary of the accomplishments of the House thus far this session. I ask unanimous consent to include this summary in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FOOD PRICES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, according to this morning's paper the President has called the Cabinet in to devise some means, method, or manner to control soaring food prices. It is true that the cost of food is getting out of hand, it is too high; but these same fellows who are asking for the cut today are the fellows who jacked prices up. They asked for subsidies, to support prices; they destroyed food in large quantities to boost prices up. They got subsidies and paid producers to curtail production. They are blowing hot and they are blowing cold. When prices are up they want to put them down. When prices are down they want to put them up. So the rest of us in the meantime find ourselves getting hungry. Production and more production and no Government interference is the answer. High prices of pork and scarcity of fats are directly due to Government interference.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as an extension of my remarks

a column by the greatest analyst of the country, Mark Sullivan, which appears in the Philadelphia Inquirer of today. The column deals with this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

TODAY

DRIVE TO CUT PRICES; BIG FACTOR IGNORED;
FOODSTUFFS TOO HIGH; FOUNDATION OF SPIRAL;
UNITED STATES BARS REDUCTION

(By Mark Sullivan)

WASHINGTON, April 8.—A score of outgivings about prices—the excessive height of them and the evil and danger of them—came last week from many sources. One was from President Truman, several from business leaders.

The statement of one business leader had the status of a public event. The head of a great department store in New York, J. I. Straus of R. H. Macy & Co., published a full-page advertisement in newspapers. To give it the momentum it deserved and received as a matter of public interest, he called a press conference.

What he said was sound and needed to be said. The spirit and content of the advertisement are suggested by two of the headings in it: "Are prices too high? Yes, they are." And "Why prices must come down." This was not said as a prophecy but as meaning that lower prices are an economic necessity, almost a moral one.

Straus dwelt at length and thoughtfully on the factors involved in high prices or affected by them—cost of living, wages, profits, the interest of consumers. He urged upon business the view that increases in industrial efficiency should be turned "into lower prices rather than into additional profits." He said that "the only way we know to retain prosperity . . . is by producing more units at lower prices." He declared that some goods were much overpriced.

But in the several hundred words in Straus' statement, one word was missing. Nowhere was the word "foodstuffs" or its equivalent "farm products." Yet about farm products, foodstuffs, these statements can be made:

Of all prices of all goods the most overpriced, the ones most out of line with other goods and with the past, are farm products, foodstuffs.

Of all prices of all goods the ones that contribute most of the high cost of living are farm products and foodstuffs. For of all expenditures that Americans make the largest proportion is for foodstuffs. They are 40 percent of the cost of living.

Of all prices of all goods the ones that work strongest for inflation are the prices of foodstuffs. For the prices of foodstuffs, because they bulk so large in the cost of living, do most to cause complaint on the part of workers, hence do most to cause demands for higher wages.

If the spiral of inflation is to be broken, the point of attack that is at once most vulnerable and most effective is prices of foodstuffs. So far as the vicious circle can be stated as a sequence, it begins with prices of foodstuffs, which cause high cost of living, which leads to demand for higher wages, which leads to higher prices of manufactured goods, which in turn contributes to still higher cost of living.

Among last week's important outgivings about high prices, one was by President Truman. It was true and it was forceful. He spoke of his "deep concern over the level of prices prevailing today." Warningly, he said "these prices must be brought down." To do this and prevent inflation he said "there is a profound moral responsibility."

So far as Mr. Truman alluded to the fields in which prices are too high, he merely spoke in a generality about unnecessarily high

prices for many commodities and for many manufactured articles. Many manufactured articles are too high, and these are the most frequent object of justified attack.

But Mr. Truman made no allusion to prices of farm products and foodstuffs, except as these might be implied in his use of the word "commodities."

That Mr. Truman made no specific allusion to foodstuffs and farm products may not be due to any political self-consciousness about the relation of Government to prices of farm products.

In any event this can be said:

The principal cause of high prices of farm products is Government. Government works directly, with conscious and specific purpose, to prevent prices of farm products from going lower. It is done for many crops and under policies of Government written into statutes.

What Government did last year about one crop, potatoes, is an illustration. The crop was large, the price was certain to fall. To keep the price up, Government bought vast quantities of potatoes. Some it sold at a loss for use in manufacturing alcohol and other products. Some it gave away. Some it left in the ground to rot. All told, about 20,000,000 bushels went to waste completely. The total loss to the Government was \$80,000,000.

AMERICAN PROPERTY IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, an AP dispatch from Manila of the date of April 3 states that \$623,000,000 worth of American property in the Philippines has been looted and stolen until only \$100,000,000 worth is left.

In February 1946 the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments called before it high ranking officers of the Army and the Navy to investigate numerous reports of the loss and destruction of American property in overseas theaters, particularly the Pacific theater. We insisted that this property be disposed of or brought home. These officers agreed to immediately order the return to this country of usable supplies not needed in the foreign theaters. They assured us that orders to this effect were then going out to all overseas commanders.

The Philippines Rehabilitation Act of 1946, in addition to authorizing the appropriation of \$400,000,000 to pay war claims in the Philippines, also authorized the transfer to the Philippine Government of \$100,000,000 in surplus property. Now it appears we have permitted the theft and destruction of enough property in the Philippine Islands to almost liquidate our one-half-billion-dollar commitment.

Mr. Speaker, this Manila report should be thoroughly investigated. Apparently the Army and the Navy have not carried out their promises to the Congress. All persons guilty of negligence in these particulars should be relieved of their jobs. All persons guilty in any way of any participation in these thefts should be prosecuted to the full limit of the law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Make the Names Public."

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials from the Evening Star.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

JOSEPH PULITZER

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include an article entitled "The Post-Dispatch Platform."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow a 3-cent stamp commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Joseph Pulitzer will be placed on sale. This stamp will be the first American postage to bear the likeness of a journalist with the exception of Franklin who has been honored as a statesman rather than as an editor. Ceremonies at the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, which Mr. Pulitzer founded, will mark the first day of sale and thereafter the stamps will be available in post offices throughout the country.

This stamp will serve to renew public interest in the career of Joseph Pulitzer. Coming to this country an immigrant from Hungary in 1864, he served in the Civil War. At the end of the war, in his search for employment, he came to St. Louis. There young Pulitzer became a reporter for the Westliche Post, and it was not long before he advanced himself to the position of co-editor of the paper. There he found himself. Newspaper work was not only the means of his livelihood but it became the lifeblood of his existence. Journalism was no longer a trade but became a profession—one of the most important professions in the world. Appropriately the commemorative stamp bears the quotation, "Our Republic and its press will rise or fall together," which is an expression of his conviction that a free press and a democratic government are inseparable.

After a decade of successful reporting which led him into politics and many other fields, he bought the St. Louis Dispatch, which was then in financial distress, and merged it with the St. Louis

Post. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch was the first of the modern newspapers. It became in his day, and is still, one of the beacons of American journalism. Later he purchased the New York World, which under his leadership shared a common virtue with the St. Louis Post-Dispatch—a sincere adherence to the cause of the under dog.

His death in 1911 brought to an end the career of one of our most distinguished journalists. Perhaps there have been more spectacular men who have built newspapers, and perhaps some were more successful in profits and circulation. But Mr. Pulitzer brought to the profession a rare combination of integrity and idealism and the press of the United States is better for his having lived. It is fitting and proper, therefore, to honor him by the issuance of this stamp.

No statement I might make could better describe the character of this man than the platform he left the Post-Dispatch, which is familiar to the readers of that newspaper and which I include as a part of my remarks:

THE POST-DISPATCH PLATFORM

I know that my retirement will make no difference in its cardinal principles; that it will always fight for progress and reform, never tolerate injustice or corruption, always fight demagogues of all parties, never belong to any party, always oppose privileged classes and public plunderers, never lack sympathy with the poor, always remain devoted to the public welfare, never be satisfied with merely printing news, always be drastically independent, never be afraid to attack wrong, whether by predatory plutocracy or predatory poverty.

JOSEPH PULITZER.

APRIL 10, 1907.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, April 16, and on Thursday, April 17, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was asking some of the Members on our side of the House in reference to a bill passed by the Senate regarding the Commodity Credit Corporation buying all the wool in this country and selling it at any price it might see fit. To think of the tariff being reduced on wool when it was made to protect the sheep growers and the wage earner. It is just ridiculous to permit the State Department to reduce tariff on wool, then have the Commodity Credit Corporation buy up all the wool, sell it for any price they want to less than their guaranty price—wrecking the Treasury. Oh, what poor business.

Oh, what a sin to our people. Oh, what legislators.

Now, being in the wool-manufacturing business, I like to buy wool as cheap as I can, but when I do that from the CCA I am going to let the Federal Treasury be the goat and be stuck for all that they sell, that is, the difference in the price that they paid for the wool and the price they sell it for. But, we do not have any money to take out of the Treasury. No money to waste. What we want to do is to get the Committee on Ways and Means to insist that this tariff is not going to be reduced. We want to get after the Committee on Ways and Means and tell them that the only thing we can do to protect American industry and American labor is to keep the tariff on the things that we want to support in this country. That is the right and honest way to do it, and I want the Committee on Ways and Means to get busy.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. That power is not in the Committee on Ways and Means. The Congress gave it to the President under the Reciprocal Trade Act in 1934.

Mr. RICH. Well, if we have a Republican Congress, we want to take it away from the President. That is the point I want to drive home. It is our business to change that law.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one a letter and comment on soil conservation and in the other a resolution adopted by the Ninety-third Legislature of Maine.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Tyrrell Krum.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

INCREASED COST OF LIVING

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the President is becoming alarmed about the increase in the cost of living and that he is holding a conference at the White House today. May I point out to the Members here and to the Nation that so long as the Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, continues to go into the markets all over the United States and buys millions of bushels of wheat and thousands of tons of

fats and oils and foodstuffs of every kind, as it has been doing for the past 3 years, and gives it away to all the countries in the world at the expense of the taxpayers of this country, they should understand that the Federal Government, more than any other agency at the present time, is responsible for the soaring of prices which may touch off later a demand for wage increases that will bring about greater inflation dangers than ever before.

The give-away, ship-away policy of the Truman administration is the only real cause of increase in the cost of living.

THE LATE HENRY FORD

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my respects and final tribute to my fellow townsman, Henry Ford, who passed on to his heavenly reward Monday, April 7. His unexpected death came as a great shock to a grateful community. A mantle of grief covers the populace of Detroit and of Michigan. Friends and beneficiaries of his great accomplishments the world over mourn his passing.

He had vision, courage, and perseverance that were an inspiration to all who came in contact with him. His faith in the future and his confidence in his fellow man inspired him to plan and project into the distance ahead. He rose higher in the estimation of his country each time he announced another plan or project to benefit humanity.

Henry Ford was a practical idealist who believed in helping his fellow man to help himself. How well he succeeded can be judged by the prosperity of hundreds of thousands of his workers, associates and coordinated industries. The Ford industries under his direction have become the marvel of the age and a paragon in the field of mass production. As Henry Ford grew and prospered so did everyone who worked and associated with him. Men and communities prospered and expanded beyond their most sanguine plans. He planned for permanence with the aid of his late departed son, Edsel, who was a worthy son of a great father. Farsightedly, he passed on into the hands of his grandson, Henry Ford 2d, the great Ford empire, which I am sure, under his guidance, is safe for the future.

I am certain that under the directing genius of Henry Ford 2d the Ford enterprise will continue to expand and prosper to the benefit of the millions of our people.

Today the rugged remains of the great builder and industrialist which housed his noble soul lie resting in serene calm after more than fourscore years of tireless and uninterrupted effort. Henry Ford's work is done. I offer my humble prayer that God will rest his weary soul and that the perpetual light will shine upon him forever.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has just called upon the House to make the Committee on Ways and Means go to work. He has evidently some solicitude for the woolen interests of this country, whom he mentioned in his talk. It seems to me the gentleman from Pennsylvania should remember that this Congress put itself on record a couple of years ago as not wanting to travel the road of economic isolationism. If we follow the policy suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania we would kill off the export trade of this country, we would have paralysis of the great industrial output of this country, we would suffer a serious business depression, and mass unemployment. History has proven that. The reciprocal trade agreements program has been in operation since 1934, and practically every economist in the country agrees that the more we can have international trade the better it will be for ourselves and for the entire world economy.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am curious to know, and therefore make the inquiry, when we are going to fulfill the promise made to the people of the country last fall with respect to the adoption of sensible and effective labor legislation. I am likewise curious to know if emphasis is to be put upon the adoption of a measure that will accommodate the needs of peace, business, and security in this country, or if emphasis is going to be put upon the writing of a bill mainly political in character. The responsibility that rests upon us is a heavy one. The country is confidently looking to this Congress, with the Republicans now in the majority, to keep faith and fulfill the commitments they made and which the people have the right to expect.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, elaborating somewhat on the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] for early recognition by the Committee on Ways and Means of the situation we are going to face in the postwar days as a result of the type of competition we are bound to face from foreign sources with the industries and

the workingmen of this country, it is my fervent hope that the committee will watch this international situation very carefully and see to it that industry and the industries and working people of this country get a square deal.

We are all familiar with what is going on throughout the world today in the setting up of totalitarian governments with their subsidized industries and their desire to expand their world trade even to the great markets of the United States.

We know that unless the situation is watched very carefully by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, we are bound to be sold down the river as we were in 1939 when a segment of the shoe industry in our part of the country nearly succumbed.

LABOR LEGISLATION—THE TELEPHONE STRIKE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I address myself to the remarks made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. A year ago the Congress passed with the help of Members on both sides of the aisle a bill which would have offered a direct answer to the problem with which we are confronted today—the national telephone strike. The bill, when it went to the White House, contained a definite provision for the handling of disputes in public utilities where the rates are fixed by a public body. The Congress offered a specific remedy for the situation and the problem with which the country is faced today. Unfortunately that bill was vetoed.

I am not a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, but I am familiar with the fact, however, that they have been diligently engaged in conducting hearings which were concluded a week or 10 days ago, and that they have been at work drafting a committee bill. It is my unofficial information that within the next few days the results of that labor will be before the House for its consideration. I have confidence that the House, as well as the committee, is going to discharge its responsibility again.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. COX. I had no intention of creating the impression that I have the slightest doubt concerning the purposes of the committee that is considering this whole question. I think the committee is all right. I hope other influences will not lay their hands on the committee.

RECIPROCAL TRADE TREATIES

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to state to my distinguished friend from Pittsburgh that I cannot quite agree with

him in his remarks this morning concerning my very good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. It is my opinion that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is a sound, clear-thinking, honest patriotic American who is unselfish in his motives and who has no other desire, so far as the reciprocal trade treaties are concerned, other than to protect the economic and industrial life of America and the people who are dependent on it.

At the present time we are \$260,000,000,000 in debt. A million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars, and a billion dollars is a thousand million. We owe two hundred and sixty thousand million so this old ship of state is wallowing now in a sea of bankruptcy. Now, it is proposed that we enter into reciprocal-trade treaties that will wreck the economic and industrial life of the Nation so if we are financially wrecked and industrially wrecked we can all go down together.

So far as the reciprocal-trade treaties are concerned, there are some 76 glass manufacturing plants in the United States. Nineteen of them are in Pennsylvania and eight of them are in my district. They employ in my district some three or four thousand people. If we lower the tariffs on glass bottles and flood this country with cheap glass the result will be that you will wreck the glass bottle container plants, lower the standard of living of the people of my district who are dependent on this industry for their livelihood. I say we are not going to lower the standard of living of the people of our country. If these trade treaties go through it will be at the expense of American labor, and it is time that the Congress of the United States acted accordingly. The Congress elected by the American people to represent them should have the final say on reciprocal-trade agreements.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, without authority to speak for anyone, would the gentleman from Georgia permit me to say that if the leadership and the House will accept a bill which the Committee on Labor has written and which will be ready in the coming week, you will for the first time since 1935, when the Wagner Act was passed, have legislation designed to protect the public, the man who does the work, rather than legislation designed to protect the union racketeer or the union official.

The bill which has been agreed upon by a majority of the Republican members of the committee will protect the public interest and the men and women who do the work. It will protect all of the citizens of America and will be fair and equitable to everyone if enacted into law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

HIGH PRICE OF FOODSTUFFS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] pointed to the rapidly ascending price of wheat with some great alarm, and indicated it was the exportation of wheat alone which was the cause of the rising price of wheat. The gentleman should have shown his concern last year when the price-control bill was gutted on this floor. As a matter of fact, not only has the price of wheat risen unconscionably but also ham and butter and all other foodstuffs that the American family uses. Many of those foodstuffs are not being exported to foreign stores. Also the profits of corporations and of the sellers of those commodities have doubled and trebled since the price-control law was gutted on this floor. I ask the gentleman from Illinois to consider that point as well as the exportation of foodstuffs to starving people, which incidentally is concurred in by a gentleman whom we all respect, Mr. Hoover, a member of his own party.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include my cross-examination of Eric Johnston before the Committee on Un-American Activities on the subject of communistic activities in Hollywood.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HENRY FORD

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to join in paying tribute to one of our greatest Americans, Henry Ford, a man of genius unsurpassed, who did more to usher in and develop the motor age than any other man who ever lived. If it had not been for Henry Ford the average American would not be able to ride in an automobile today.

There is one thing characteristically American about Henry Ford's death. I believe it was Oliver Goldsmith who said: And, as a hare, whom hounds and horns pursue,
Pants to the place from whence at first she flew.

I still had hopes, my long vexations past,
Here to return—and die at home at last.

The thing that struck me most was the statement that Mr. Ford died in the humble home in which I believe he was

born, or near the place where he was born and reared, and a strange coincidence of fate had cut off the electricity and the heating system.

This man, who had amassed a fortune, died in his simple home, lighted only with tallow candles and oil lamps and heated only with a wood fire, typical of the simplicity of Henry Ford, one of the greatest Americans this Nation has ever seen.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

TARIFF ON WOOL

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself, primarily, to the remarks made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]. It is true that the Congress authorized the President to reduce tariffs or to raise them for that matter by 50 percent under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, but I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that very definite assurances were given at that time both by the Executive and by your Committee on Ways and Means when the matter was before the House that no action would be taken. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that within the last 2 weeks the United States Tariff Commission issued its report after exhaustive study showing that the wool growers of this country are losing 9½ cents on every pound of wool they produce. How in the name of common sense and in the light of that report can the State Department enter into negotiations to reduce the tariff on wool. Yet that is precisely what they propose to do. Our sheep population has dropped from 49,000,000 head in 1943 to 32,000,000 head today. Our production of wool has dropped from 450,000,000 pounds annually to 300,000,000 pounds during the same period. The Army and Navy Munitions Board has declared wool to be a strategic and critical commodity essential for the security of this country, yet we are slowly liquidating that great domestic industry. I think that the Committee on Ways and Means has a distinct duty to call the attention of the State Department to the fact that assurances were given this Congress at the time the act was extended that nothing would be done to impair the condition of agriculture in this country, and we expect that promise to be honored.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. MASON. It has been called to the attention of the State Department time and time again.

Mr. BARRETT. I think the gentleman's committee should bring out a resolution expressing the intent and the will of this Congress that no reduction should be made on the tariff on wool at this time. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is unduly alarmed about the proposal author-

izing the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell its stock pile of wool at competitive prices on foreign wool. The duty paid on foreign wool coming into this country amounts to around \$100,000,000 per year, and the loss, if any, on the sale of domestic wool, if any, would be negligible.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the previous order of the House, this is the day for the calling of the Consent Calendar.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL ARCHIVES ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1350) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when this bill was first called on the Consent Calendar objection was raised to the report accompanying the bill for the reason that it did not conform to the rules of the House by setting forth the changes in existing law. A supplemental report has been filed which conforms to the rule and, therefore, the objection to the consideration of the bill is withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act established a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1122-1124), as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(A) By striking out the proviso in section 3, and by inserting in lieu thereof the following language: "Provided, That whenever the head of any agency shall specify in writing restrictions on the use of examination of records being considered for transfer from his custody to that of the Archivist that appear to him to be necessary or desirable in the public interest, the Archivist shall impose such restrictions on such of the records as are transferred to his custody; and restrictions so imposed shall not be removed or relaxed by the Archivist without the concurrence in writing of the head of the agency from which the material shall have been transferred unless the existence of that agency shall have been terminated: And provided further, That restrictions on the use or examination of records in the custody of the Archivist heretofore imposed and now in force and effect under the terms of section 3 of the National Archives Act, approved June 18, 1934, shall continue in force and effect regardless of the expiration of the tenure of office of the official who imposed them but may be removed or relaxed by the Archivist with the concurrence in writing of the head of the agency from which the material has been transferred or by the Archi-

vist alone if the existence of that agency shall have been terminated."

(B) By inserting after section 6 a new section as follows:

"Sec. 6a. Whenever any records the use of which is subject to statutory limitations and restrictions are transferred to the custody of the Archivist of the United States, permissive and restrictive statutory provisions with respect to the examination and use of such records applicable to the head of the agency having custody of them or to employees of that agency shall thereafter likewise be applicable to the Archivist of the United States and to the employees of the National Archives Establishment, respectively."

(C) By inserting after section 8 a new section as follows:

"Sec. 8a. Any official of the United States Government who is authorized to make certifications or determinations on the basis of records in his custody is hereby authorized to make certifications or determinations on the basis of records that have been transferred by him or his predecessors to the custody of the Archivist of the United States."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAISING CEILINGS ON WAGES AND ALLOWANCES TO VETERANS UNDERGOING TRAINING ON THE JOB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 246) to raise the ceilings on wages and allowances payable to veterans undergoing training on the job, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] has promised to have a hearing on the bill and I believe a rule will be granted.

It is vital that this legislation be passed quickly. Many veterans have had to give up their training because there was a ceiling on the amount of money they could secure in the colleges, also in on-the-job training. Many have had to give up the training because the ceilings were not raised. I think that when the House understands the bill there will be absolutely no objection to it. That is why I have asked that it go over without prejudice.

I also ask, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks at this point a very fine article by Catherine Coyne, of the Boston Herald, who speaks of the plight of one family, and the difficulties they are having in trying to continue. Whether they will make it or not is problematical. The veterans started their training under different legislation. It was unfair to pass the bill which became law last summer. It should be repealed. It was a stab in the back. Many Members of Congress during the recent elections pledged themselves to repeal that unjust law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts to extend her remarks in the manner indicated?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

VETERAN FAMILIES AT HARVARD FIGHTING FROM NEW FOX HOLES

(By Catherine Coyne)

That brave new world everyone talked about during the war years still seems a long way off to many veterans studying at Harvard University. The fox holes they dug in the volcanic ash of Iwo Jima or in the snow of the Ardennes have been replaced by psychological fox holes into which fighters-turned-students have crawled for their battle for a better way of life.

It is a battle. Go into any one of the temporary yellow houses in those Cambridge rows, such as Jarvis Court, and you will sense the atmosphere of battle—the gay, high courage, the dogged determination that defies weariness, and the hard concentration on optimism.

A few have quit the battle. More will surrender because they are stalled by lack of funds.

Myles and Marguerite Boylan wearily confessed yesterday that if they could get a house with one of the several jobs put in their way, they would snap it up. As things are now, however, they will struggle on through another year until Myles gets his degree in city planning.

Many Americans have had the mistaken idea that students studying under the GI bill of rights are completely subsidized. Even some of the students themselves thought that \$90-a-month subsistence allowance for married veterans would carry them and their families while they acquired their education. Most of those who tried out that theory gave up long ago.

Myles and Marguerite Boylan knew it couldn't be done. They planned on that \$90, of course, to eke what they felt they could earn while he prepared to plan cities of the future.

While he concentrated on his degree thesis, she undertook the task of planning, with the desperate urgency of a military strategist, how to stretch out that GI allowance with her small salary as a part-time teacher and the \$110 a month her husband is able to earn on the side to cover the costs of living.

The struggle was intensified by their determination not to abandon any of the insurance commitments they undertook while Boylan was a Naval Reserve officer. After all, they had the future of their children—4-year-old Gerald and 3-year-old Ann—to consider.

"We have no real complaints," Mrs. Boylan said. "It's been a difficult winter, however, partly because the cost of food has skyrocketed, but primarily because we've had so much sickness. We'd get along if only we could remain healthy."

MRS. BOYLAN TEACHES

"I haven't any gripes," her husband said. But there was a look of discontent on his serious face. "It's just that I can't see the fairness of the Government putting such a low limit on what we can earn on the side. Sure, I know there were some taking advantage of the Government, but I feel they were few in number."

"I could work for a Boston architectural firm without interfering with my studies," he explained. "But the Government stipulation is that my gross income—not my net, after deduction for taxes—cannot be in excess of \$200. That means, I'm limited to earning \$110 on the side."

They tried living on that \$200, but they couldn't do it. Mrs. Boylan took a job as part-time teacher of French and mathematics in a private school, which provided the family with another \$90 a month, less taxes, of course.

Living costs and insurance total between \$300 and \$350 a month for the Boylans. They can get by on \$250, but that amount makes no provision for clothes cleaning, shoe repair, newspapers or for what Boylan described as an occasional splurge necessary for the maintenance of their equilibrium.

That splurge takes the form of an infrequent movie, perhaps; or a better selection of meat after the monotony of the cheapest cuts week after week; or bacon for a rare, scrumptious breakfast. The Boylans justify that bacon—about a half a pound a month—by pointing out the bacon fat makes a good substitute for expensive shortening.

Things were going along fairly smoothly until after Christmas. Then the children got colds, one after another. Mrs. Boylan became ill—the doctor said it was physical and nervous exhaustion. She became well again, but the family savings, carefully accumulated during years of separation during the war for a home of their own, began to disappear.

According to their present schedule, they can keep going until a year from June. By then, their savings will have been exhausted.

They were grateful to Harvard for its cooperation with these fighters seeking education. They have a three-bedroom apartment, with a large general room for cooking, dining, and living, which costs them \$35 a month. This is heated by an oil space-heater. Cooking is done on two electric plates. Mrs. Boylan does the family laundry with an electric washing machine, bought on the installment plan, to save high laundry costs.

Their experience is fairly typical of the married students with children. Some have better backlogs of savings. Some have an even more precarious existence.

Up the street, pretty Mrs. Jacob Lynch stopped rearranging her baby's room long enough to admit that without the savings of the war years, when she worked while her husband fought in the Pacific, living and studying at Harvard probably would have been impossible.

"We're living on those savings now," she said.

Little Jerry Lynch, who is almost a year old, gurgled with glee to attract attention. He was sticking out his chest with show-off pride.

"And, of course," she said, with a giggle at her baby, "Grandma comes through again and again, now with gifts of food and every now and again with clothes for the baby. We'll make it."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Is there objection?

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to point out to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs—I do not know whether she was here this morning or not when I informed the membership of it—that a discharge petition was filed on the Speaker's desk today. In view of this fact I would rather see the gentleman modify her request and ask that the bill be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from New York would rather have the bill stricken from the Consent Calendar? The bill was introduced by the gentleman from New York and passed with an amendment. It passed the Committee on Veterans' Affairs unanimously. He always works tirelessly for the veterans. The House

knows his gallant and distinguished war record.

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to modify my request if that is agreeable to the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman from New York should make it plain that he is not speaking about a petition to discharge the Veterans' Committee, but the Committee on Rules.

Mr. KEARNEY. I think the House realizes that, but I would like to have that definitely understood at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Veterans' Affairs Committee reported the bill out unanimously. The committee is very anxious to have the bill pass the Congress at once. Delay is unjust.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the bill be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRESERVING THE CONTINUITY OF RESIDENCE IN THE UNITED STATES FOR NATURALIZATION PURPOSES IN THE CASES OF ALIEN RESIDENTS WHO DEPARTED FOR SERVICE IN ALLIED ARMED FORCES DURING THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2032) to preserve the continuity of residence in the United States for naturalization purposes in the cases of alien residents who departed for service in Allied armed forces during the Second World War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to interrogate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] in reference to this bill. May I ask him whether or not a report of the Justice Department has been given in connection with it?

Mr. MASON. Yes. This bill is the same bill practically as H. R. 513 which was passed by the House last year and which did have a report from the Attorney General giving full approval to it. I read from that report:

This bill is identical with legislation which was introduced at my request and favorably reported by the committee on February 25. Accordingly, I recommend the enactment of the bill.

Then he stated that the Bureau of the Budget has been consulted and the report approved.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I am thinking of some Italians who were drafted by Mussolini. They went over to Italy, they fought in the Italian war against the French and against the Americans. Now they want to come back to this country as good American citizens. If this bill is going to permit those fellows to come back, I do not want any part of it.

Mr. MASON. The bill absolutely and unequivocally does not cover that type of person. It only covers those who left here in order to join up with our Allied armies between 1939 and 1941, when we got into the war, to protect their residence for naturalization purposes and

only those who fought with our allies and with us are covered by the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 307 of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1142; 8 U. S. C. 707), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(e) The continuity of residence in the United States for naturalization purposes shall not be considered as having been interrupted by the action of an alien who was a lawful permanent resident of the United States in departing from the United States (1) after September 1, 1939, and before December 7, 1941, for the purpose of serving in, and if he was honorably discharged from, the armed forces of a foreign country at war with a country which declared war on the United States, or (2) on or after December 7, 1941, with the consent of his local draft board, the Director of the Selective Service System, or the appropriate military or naval authorities of the United States if the alien had been inducted, for the purpose of serving in, and if he was honorably discharged from, the armed forces of the country of his allegiance, such country being at war with a country at war with the United States: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall be applicable only to those aliens who return to the United States for permanent residence within a period of 1 year from the date of the enactment of this subsection and are lawfully readmitted into the United States as immigrants."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out the words "declared war on" and insert in lieu thereof the words "thereafter declared war on or was at war with."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OPERATION OF PLANTATIONS OUTSIDE THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1358) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations, outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask those who are advocating the enactment of this proposal whether or not it is intended by the bill or by amendment thereto to change the present operation of the farm that is operated by the Navy at Annapolis?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. No. It has no relationship to any farm at Annapolis, but pertains to farms at Puerto Rico and Trinidad, in the Caribbean.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 624), is hereby repealed.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: Strike out the last word and substitute the following in lieu thereof: "amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. After the termination of the present war the management, operation, maintenance, and improvement of any plantation or farm for which appropriations made available by this act are used shall be accomplished, insofar as practicable, through the instrumentality of a private contractor, lessee, or operator, with or for the Government, and to this end the Secretary of the Navy shall make reasonable effort to enter into said contract, lease, or agreement with a person, partnership, or association in civil life for his or its services upon terms advantageous to the Government for such management, operation, maintenance, and improvement before employing naval or Marine Corps personnel for that purpose: *Provided*, That the determination of the Secretary of the Navy as to reasonableness of effort to enter into such contract, lease, or agreement, and as to the advantageous nature of the terms thereof shall be final."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, perhaps a brief explanation of the purpose of this amendment is advisable at this time to clear up any misunderstanding or doubt that may exist in the minds of interested members regarding the purpose and effect of the amendment.

In connection with the acquisition of a military site at Trinidad, which was a part of the exchange of destroyers negotiated with Great Britain in 1940, the United States Navy Department acquired a tract of land of some 3,000 acres which, though a part of the larger Naval Establishment, was a tropical citrus farm or plantation. The military use of that area was such as not to seriously interfere with the agricultural operation of the area but was an essential military use.

Subsequently the Navy came to the Committee on Naval Affairs seeking legislation to permit the Navy to operate that farm by its own personnel. The Navy Committee through a subcommittee made an investigation and came to the conclusion that if the Navy Department fully performed its job of running an effective Navy and was not expected to branch out into agricultural and agrarian pursuits, the Navy would have accomplished its public mission. Therefore, the Committee on Naval Affairs disapproved the bill authorizing the Navy to go into the farming business.

However, since we at that time were at war—the continuance of the operation of this farm and other similar truck-garden areas in the south Pacific islands was a part of the war operation—the Congress did put a limitation on the authorization given to the Navy that that authority should terminate with the war. Now the Navy comes again to Congress seeking to remove that limitation which was imposed back there 3 or 4 years ago by giving the Navy full authority to operate any areas that it may have under its jurisdiction located outside of the United States for agricultural purposes. No one disputes or questions the necessity or the desirability of obtaining fresh fruits and vegetables, milk, eggs, meats, and citrus fruits for our military people, but to have

that work done by naval personnel seems altogether unnecessary and unreasonable and uneconomical.

A striking illustration of the ill-advisedness of having the work done by the Navy is one which I noticed in the most recent visit I made to the Trinidad plantation 2 or 3 years ago. The Navy man in charge of this 3,000-acre farm, for which the Government has paid around \$200,000, and which we are trying to operate on a profitable basis, was a very junior officer of the Navy, who had been trained by the Navy in radio technology. It is unthinkable and not to be expected that a Navy man should know how to operate a farm profitably or economically.

The purpose of the amendment I have offered is to require the Secretary of the Navy to endeavor to obtain this work through private contract either by lease, by management contract, or by some contractual arrangement by which the influences of private enterprise will be applied to the operation of the farms. After the Secretary has made a reasonable effort to have that work done by private enterprise and has failed, then the Navy is authorized to go ahead and use public funds for the farming business.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. As I understand the gentleman, the purpose of his amendment is to give an alternative method of operating those plantations.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is to require an alternative method, but in the event of inability to pursue that alternative method the Navy is authorized to go ahead and operate the area.

Mr. BROOKS. Has the Navy passed upon the amendment? Is it acceptable to the Navy?

Mr. COLE of New York. As far as I know, the Navy still wants to be farmers, but I can assure the gentleman that from my own standpoint I still want the Navy to be sailors, not farmers.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the amendment although I believe it is the best part of valor to accept it, because the gentleman from New York is going to object to the bill anyway. I am given to understand that the Navy does object very strongly on the ground of security to having any private operation on this farm. There is one thing we must keep in mind, that these two farms, at Trinidad, and San Juan, Puerto Rico, returned a profit of \$10,000 from their operations as of the first of January of this year.

In the area there is no fresh fruit available. There are no fresh vegetables available. The funds that are given for what we call naval subsistence are being used for this purpose. There is a very extraordinary situation in that area as far as the availability of fresh foods is concerned. The Navy firmly believes that they ought to be permitted to continue on these farms as they have in

the past. With all the magazines and other naval facilities in that area, they look with some disfavor on the private operation of the farms, for the reason, first of all, that the whole area is plowed up, with ditches running all over it, which makes it impracticable to have large-scale operations. Further, the fact that they have been able to operate these farms at a profit of \$10,000 since they have begun shows that they are doing a fairly good job and serving the purpose of getting fresh fruits and vegetables, eggs and chickens that they cannot get unless they are given permission to operate these farms that they have developed on this land that was leased for 99 years from the British Government during the war period.

I have no objection to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, but I am sorry the gentleman offered it as the Navy does not approve it. Under its provisions, the Secretary of the Navy must make a reasonable effort to enter into a contract, but his word is final as to the reasonableness of his effort and the advantages to the Navy. As long as the gentleman from New York has those provisions in the amendment, I have no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman from New York. There is no possibility of the amendment having anything to do with the operations within the continental United States?

Mr. COLE of New York. No. I endeavored to convey that answer to the gentleman in my discussion of the bill.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I was quite sure the gentleman did, but I wanted the answer in the Record in such a way that there can be no question in the mind of anyone about it.

Mr. COLE of New York. The statute this bill seeks to amend applies only to areas under the Navy Department located outside the continental United States; therefore, very definitely this does not apply to the Annapolis operation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, we accept the amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. My only reason for asking for the division is that the gentleman from Massachusetts made the statement that he personally is opposed to such an amendment. I should like to have an expression from the House. Therefore, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 47, noes 2.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REORGANIZATION OF NAVY DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1369) to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, for the purpose of making section 3 thereof permanently effective.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940 (54 Stat. 494), is amended by striking out from the first sentence thereof the following words: "to serve during any national emergency declared by him to exist, including the present limited emergency."

With the following committee amendments:

That the following new section be added: "Sec. 2. The act entitled 'An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties,' approved December 16, 1940 (54 Stat. 1224), as amended, is amended as follows:

"(a) By striking from the title thereof the words 'during national emergencies';

"(b) By striking the first sentence from the last paragraph of section 2 thereof."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes,' approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled 'An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties,' approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE NAVAL RESERVE

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 90) to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 1 of the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), is hereby amended by striking out the phrase "including citizens of the Philippine Islands who are members of the naval service at the time independence of the Philippine Islands becomes effective," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "including citizens of the Philippine Islands who were in the naval service on July 4, 1946, or, who having been discharged from the naval service on or prior to this date, reenlisted therein subsequent thereto but before the expiration of 90 days following discharge."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "this" and insert "that."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "90 days" and insert "3 months."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 534, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1564) to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 363) to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946, Public Law 534, Seventy-ninth Congress, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.), be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"To establish the interstate or foreign commerce character of any shipment in any prosecution under this act the waybill, or other shipping document, of such shipment shall be prima facie evidence of the place from which and to which such shipment was made."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1564) was laid on the table.

FORT WAYNE MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2183) providing for the conveyance to the city of Detroit, Mich., of that portion of the Fort Wayne Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Wayne Military Reservation is located in my district. When this matter first was brought to my attention by the Mayor Edward Jeffries and president Edwards of the Common Council of the City of Detroit there seemed to be some misunderstanding between the National Guard and the city as to its use and disposition. I was informed that the matter was discussed also with Senator FERGUSON, who in all likelihood would prepare a bill. I said if that were the case I would withhold the introduction of a bill favoring the transfer of the property to the city of Detroit or such portion of it as could be agreed upon between the War Department and the city of Detroit. I stated, however, that in order to expedite the passage of the bill, it would be wise to introduce a companion bill in the House with no difference in the phraseology or conditions in order that it might fore-

stall the possibility of a conference between the two Houses. I informed the mayor that if he would tell the junior Senator from my State that if and when the bill was prepared he would notify me I would introduce a bill to that effect on this side of the Capitol. I was assured that would be done. I have not heard about it until the bill was before the committee. However, precedent to that I did talk to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] a member of the Armed Services Committee, and explained to him my interest in the favorable consideration of this bill. The interest of the city of Detroit and the War Department, I am certain, are carefully protected in this bill, but what I want the RECORD to show, and I would like to have some assurance, particularly from my colleague from the Fourteenth District of Michigan [Mr. YOUNGBLOOD], that this thing happened as he assured me at the time, without any collusion or understandings that were outside the customary procedure and the ordinary observation of courtesies between Members. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan if that is true.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Does the gentleman raise objection?

Mr. DINGELL. I am not raising any objection. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. This was brought before me by the mayor of the city of Detroit. It was supposed to be a companion bill. So far as I know, two amendments had to be placed on this bill in order that it be passed. Otherwise the War Department would not give a favorable report. So I explained the situation to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], and I would like the explanation I gave him placed in the RECORD.

Mr. DINGELL. I just wanted the RECORD to show that this matter was not any unusual or collusive procedure; that it was without any manipulation whatsoever. I do not want to be placed in the light of being derelict in my duties.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. I might say to my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] that I introduced the bill in good faith at the request of Mayor Jeffries and other city officials who called at my office. In doing so, I had in mind the ethics of Congress established by custom and practice, and I assure the gentleman that there was no manipulation, politically or otherwise, on my part. I recognize the need of this property for use by the city, and, as I previously stated, I sponsored the bill at the request of these responsible Detroit officials and did so only with the interests of the city of Detroit in mind.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does this bill call for the War Department giving land to the city of Detroit or are they going to buy it?

Mr. DINGELL. No. A portion of it is given to the city of Detroit for public purposes. It is a small area that is hemmed in by industries, and for all practical purposes it will never make a useful military site.

Mr. RICH. Is the land valuable?

Mr. DINGELL. Well, doubtless river-front property in the city of Detroit will have some value, but it will be of more value for public purposes than to remain idle and to be maintained by the Federal Government. If it is taken off the hands of the War Department and put to public use, there will be material savings as far as the War Department is concerned. The bill has within it ample provision to protect the War Department, as I am sure the chairman and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] will testify, to protect the interests of the United States Government. So, meantime, I assume the bill provides merely a sort of trusteeship of the property until such time as it may be needed by the War Department.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to say with reference to this matter that it came before the committee in the regular course and was heard like any other bill. It was explained to the committee that the surplus property there had very great historical value and that if it were turned over to the city it would not injure the Army in any way. It would save the Army money. Actually, it would accomplish a very fine public purpose if it were used as a park in the city of Detroit. I am glad the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is in favor of the bill. Am I correct in that?

Mr. DINGELL. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I desire to confirm what has been said, especially by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. This property not only has a very fine value for park purposes but it also has a value in that they can use the barracks for housing purposes in the city of Detroit, and the hospital that is within the fort for hospital purposes. In addition to that, it will preserve a very historic shrine, and also strengthen that bond of friendship that exists between the United States and Canada, in removing one of those border forts that exists in an expanse of 3,000 miles.

I hope the bill will be passed without any objection whatever.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNGBLOOD], who introduced this measure, both on the measure and on the manner in which he produced his witnesses before the committee and the subcommittee, the mayor of Detroit, and the common council.

I may say that this bill emanated from one of our subcommittees headed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], one of the best lawyers in the House of Representatives. The entire matter was thoroughly investigated by the committee. There was complete unanimity of opinion everywhere along the line, and it was reported unanimously by both the subcommittee and the full Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Detroit, Mich., that portion of land constituting the Fort Wayne Military Reservation, together with the buildings and other improvements thereto, and the rights and appurtenances thereto belonging or appertaining, determined by him to be surplus to the requirements of the War Department.

SEC. 2. Such conveyance shall contain the provision that whenever the Congress of the United States shall declare a state of war or other national emergency to exist, upon the determination by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy that the property so conveyed is useful or necessary for military or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have a right to reenter upon such property and use the same or any part thereof for the duration of such state of war or other national emergency.

SEC. 3. Such conveyance shall contain the further provision that if the city of Detroit shall, at any time, cease to use the property so conveyed for public purposes, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "deed", insert "without compensation."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "right", insert "without paying compensation."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the statement I had reference to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INCREASED PAY OF CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN OF SERVICE ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 321) to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill would result in an annual cost to the Treasury of \$1,300,000. There does not seem to be any great shortage of applicants for the Academies. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee exactly what the need is for passing the bill at the present time?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The fact is that there has been no increase in the allowances for cadets at the Military and Naval Academies since prior to World War I, I believe, not since 1907.

It has been shown that the allowances to the young men at the Academies is so low that it is not sufficient for them to save enough money during the 4 years of their attendance at the Academy with which to purchase uniforms to become second lieutenants, or ensigns, as the

case may be. At the present time it is requisite and mandatory for those young men to buy their first set of uniform to become officers.

The purpose of the bill is merely to equalize the allowances between the two services and to raise it to such an amount that the cadets and midshipmen will have enough saved up at the end of their 4 years of training to be reasonably expected to buy their own uniforms.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. Ordinarily when a person is commissioned in the Army or the Navy he receives an allowance for uniforms. Is not that true?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is after he becomes an officer of the Army.

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. They do not become officers until after graduation.

Mr. KEAN. Then would they not have this uniform allowance?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Not with which to buy their first set of uniforms.

All of the boys who go to the Academies do not come from wealthy families. It is assumed that they should be able to save from their allowances a sufficient sum by graduation to buy a set of uniforms to become an officer. These boys must purchase their uniforms out of the allowance we give them.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Government spends \$19,000 during the 4 years one of these boys goes to one of the academies. That is what it costs the United States Government per man to educate a young man at either of the academies. They receive this splendid free education for a life's profession. Certainly the least he can do is to buy his uniform.

By not passing this bill we can save a million dollars. We have got to save every penny we can. We are not taking anything from that boy by not passing this bill. He is getting a \$19,000 education paid for by the Federal Government. He ought to be willing to go out and work and save some of his money to buy his uniforms. I do not think it is a practical thing to do under present conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman modify his request and ask that the bill go over without prejudice?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF TECHNICAL ERRORS IN ACT APPROVED AUGUST 13, 1936 (PUBLIC LAW 729, 79TH CONG., 2D SESS.)

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 116) to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Strike out "6 (a)" in paragraph (a) of section 3 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "(a) of section 6."

(b) Insert a comma between the second occurrence of the word "work" and the word "and" in clause (1) of paragraph (b) of section 3.

(c) Strike out the first occurrence of the word "and" and substitute in lieu thereof a comma in clause (2) of paragraph (b) of section 3.

(d) Strike out the word "part" wherever occurring in section 4 and substitute in lieu thereof the word "paragraph."

(e) Strike out the word "part" in section 5 and substitute in lieu thereof the word "paragraph."

(f) Insert between the letter "(a)" and the word "Midshipmen" in subsection (a) of section 6 the following: "1."

(g) Strike out "section 3 (a)" in the first paragraph of subsection (a) of section 6 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "paragraph (a) of section 3."

(h) Strike out "section 3 (b)" in paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "paragraph (b) of section 3"; and in the same said paragraph strike out the word "part" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "paragraph."

(i) Insert a comma between the second occurrence of the word "year" and the word "and" in subsection (d) of section 6.

(j) Amend section 7 to read as follows: "Sec. 7. Any officer commissioned under paragraph 1 of subsection (a) of section 6 or under subsection (b) of section 6 may, upon his own application, after not less than 15 months or 2 years, respectively, of satisfactory service as a commissioned officer, have his commission in the Regular service terminated and be commissioned in the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve, and in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be released from active duty. The date of rank in such commission in a reserve component shall be the same as that of the commission previously held in the Regular service."

(k) Strike out "subsection 2 of section 6 (a)" in section 8 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6."

(l) Strike out "subsection 2 of section 6 (a)" in subsection (a) of section 9 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 6."

(m) Strike out "subsection 1 of section 6 (a)" in the first sentence of subsection (b) of section 9 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "paragraph 1 of subsection (a) of section 6." In the same said first sentence strike out "section 6 (b)" and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "subsection (b) of section 6."

(n) Strike out "subsection 9 (a)" in section 10 and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "subsection (a) of section 9."

(o) Amend section 16 to read as follows: "Sec. 16. (a) The President may appoint annually 75 midshipmen to the United States Naval Academy from among the sons of Army, Navy, and Marine Corps personnel."

"(b) The act of December 20, 1917 (40 Stat. 430), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows: 'There shall be allowed at the United States Naval Academy 5 midshipmen for each Senator, Representative, Delegate in Congress, and Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and from the District of Columbia, 160 appointed annually from enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, and 160 appointed annually from enlisted men of the Naval Reserve and

Marine Corps Reserve by the Secretary of the Navy under similar conditions so far as applicable as prescribed by law for appointments from enlisted men of the Navy."

(p) Strike out the word "not" in section 19. Substitute the word "and" in lieu of the word "nor" in the same said section.

SEC. 2. This joint resolution shall be effective from August 13, 1946.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO GRANT TO SAN DIEGO A RIGHT-OF-WAY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 231) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to grant to the city of San Diego, Calif., upon such terms and conditions as he may determine, a right-of-way for the construction, maintenance, operation, and repair of a water pipe line or lines within a strip of land 50 feet in width and 2,650 feet in length, more or less, which strip traverses land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING NAME OF LUGERT-ALTUS IRRIGATION PROJECT, OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 797) to change the name of the Luget-Altus irrigation project in the State of Oklahoma to the W. C. Austin project.

MR. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1556) to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation.

MR. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2369) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by locator in the Territory of Alaska.

MR. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

MR. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands whether or not the presentation of this bill may be in-

terpreted to mean that the committee does not expect to report any bills providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims generally? This bill is limited to suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims in the Territory of Alaska. In the past few years we have been told this suspension of annual assessment work should be discontinued in order that miners might know whether their claims were in good standing or not and that locators might know where they stood in locating new claims, but the waiver of the requirement for annual work has been carried through one pretext or another, the war, the depression or whatnot.

MR. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced by the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and received very careful consideration by a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and again by the full committee. It has the approval of the Department of the Interior, and was unanimously supported by both the subcommittee and the full committee.

MR. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the gentleman from Arkansas has already asked that it go over without prejudice, to which I have no objection, but I was hoping that we might know whether or not this is in the nature of an exception and whether the people who are interested in mining claims in the States should be told to plan to do their assessment work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

MR. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the second bill in succession reported by the Committee on Public Lands as to which requests have been made that be passed over without prejudice. Mr. Speaker, may I remind the Members of the House that the present Committee on Public Lands is made up of six former legislative committees. The committee is divided into five subcommittees and they have been working every day in the week except Sunday. Sometimes two or three committees are working at the same time. Over 200 bills and resolutions have been referred to the committee. I have no objection to the request that a bill go over without prejudice, but I do think the committee is entitled to know the reason for the request.

MR. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, my request to pass the bill over without prejudice came about by the fact that my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN] was assigned to study this bill, but he is not present today. I have not had the opportunity to look at it as closely as I should, but after the discussion and discussing it with my colleague from Colorado and others I now understand the purpose of the bill, and therefore I withdraw my request.

MR. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not object because I have no particular concern about what happens to the mining claims in Alaska. If there is some reason for continuing

the suspension of work there, well and good. I would object, however, if this was setting a precedent, however, to continue suspension of assessment work in the States generally. When the suspension question has come up in recent years, the Committee on Mines and Mining, which is now absorbed in the Committee on Public Lands, has been saying, "We are not going to do this any more," and Members have been advised to tell the claim holders that they should prepare to do their assessment work again. But as I say, because of the depression or the war this waiver has been extended from year to year. Now, we ought to keep faith, I think, with the people who have been told that and not suspend the assessment work any further on claims in the States unless there is some exceptional or extraordinary circumstance connected with it.

MR. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I might say to my colleague from South Dakota that there was a bill before the Committee on Public Lands to suspend the assessment work on mining claims in the continental United States and also in Alaska. There was some objection raised at the time to the suspension of assessment work on claims in the continental United States, and consequently a new bill was drawn that granted that right solely to mining claims in Alaska. I might say on behalf of the bill that the evidence disclosed that it was practically impossible at the present time to get the help in Alaska to do the assessment work, and the committee felt that for one more year this privilege should be extended to the owners of mining claims in Alaska.

MR. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Wyoming has given the information I desire, and therefore I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which requires on each mining claim located, and until a patent has been issued therefor, not less than \$100 worth of labor to be performed or improvements aggregating such amount to be made each year, be, and the same is hereby, suspended as to all mining claims in the Territory of Alaska, until the hour of 12 o'clock meridian on the 1st day of July 1948: *Provided,* That every claimant of any such mining claim in order to obtain the benefits of this act shall file, or cause to be filed, in the office where the location notice or certificate is recorded, on or before 12 o'clock meridian of July 1, 1948, a notice of his desire to hold said mining claim under this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLOWANCES TO PRISON INMATES FOR CERTAIN SERVICES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1999) to authorize additional allowances of good time and the payment of compensation to prison inmates performing exceptionally meritorious or outstanding services.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **COLE** of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I point out that this bill, while technically it does not amend existing law, actually the effect of it is to amend existing law. Under present law inmates in our prison institutions are given certain deductions for good behavior and for certain types of work. This bill would include other types of work for which credit or allowances against the penalty or sentence could be made. If the bill amended existing law the rules of the House would require that the changes which this bill makes in existing law be shown in the report. Since the bill actually does not change existing law, the rules of the House do not make that requirement, but the effect so far as the Members of the House are concerned, is the same.

I, for the moment, would ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice, solely for the purpose of calling attention to the Committee on the Judiciary and other committees of the House that where bills have the effect of amending existing law but actually or technically do not, at least the spirit of the Ramseyer rule should be observed and the report show the change that is made by the pending bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. **KEATING**. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the rule to which reference has been made does not require, where there is not in fact a change in the existing law, that the existing law be set out. The exact, factual situation is set forth in this report which is submitted. I want to call that to the attention of the House.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES OF THE WIND RIVER RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1098) to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to divide the trust funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the joint credit of the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation, Wyo., including the unexpended balance of the treaty funds arising under section 12 of the act of June 7, 1897 (30 Stat. 93), between the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapaho Tribe, crediting one-half of the total amount to a trust fund account for each tribe: *Provided*, That in dividing the funds there shall be taken into consideration in determining the amount to be credited to each tribe the outstanding loans made from joint trust funds to the Indians of each tribe.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury, upon request of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized and directed to establish a trust fund account for each tribe and to make such transfer of funds on the books of his department as may be necessary to effect the purpose of section 1 of this act: *Provided*,

That interest earned at the rate of 4 percent per annum shall be credited to the principal trust fund accounts established by this section: *Provided further*, That all future revenues derived from the Wind River Reservation under existing law shall be divided in accordance with section 1 of this act and credited to the trust fund accounts established herein.

Sec. 3. That notwithstanding any other provision of existing law, one-third of the trust funds credited to the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapaho Tribe by this act shall be available for expenditure or for advance to the tribe for such purposes as may be requested by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary of the Interior or such official as may be designated by him, and the other two-thirds of said trust fund shall be paid semiannually, on the 1st day of September and the 1st day of March each year, per capita, to the individual members of said tribes.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 17, after "That", insert "for a period of 5 years from and after the enactment of this legislation."

Page 3, at the end of the bill insert ": *Provided, however*, That said per capita payment shall not be subject to any lien or claim of any nature against any of such members unless the tribal council of such member shall consent thereto in writing, except as to reimbursable Treasury loans made to individual members of either tribe which may be due to the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. **BARRETT**. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. **BARRETT**: Strike out all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of existing law, the trust funds credited to the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapaho Tribe, respectively, under the provisions of this act, shall be available for expenditure or for advance to the tribe for such purposes as may be requested by the tribal council and approved by the Secretary of the Interior or such official as may be designated by him: *Provided*, That two-thirds of said trust funds as initially established, and two-thirds of all sums credited thereto during a period of 5 years from and after the enactment of this act, shall be paid on the 1st day of September and the 1st day of March each year, per capita, to the individual members of said tribes, and any sums distributed per capita out of the funds described in section 1 of this act on or after April 1, 1947, shall be taken into consideration in determining the sums to be distributed under this proviso to the same effect as if this act had been in force on and after April 1, 1947: *Provided further*, That said per capita payments shall not be subject to any lien or claim of any nature against any of the members of said tribes unless the tribal council of such member shall consent thereto in writing, except as to reimbursable Treasury loans made to individual members of either tribe which may be due to the United States, and except as to irrigation charges owed by individual Indians to the United States, but this latter exception shall not become operative until a report upon irrigation charges within the Wind River irrigation project has been made and becomes effective in accordance with the act of July 1, 1932 (ch. 369, 47 Stat. 564)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CUSTODIANS WHO NEGLIGENTLY SUFFER PRISONERS TO ESCAPE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 26) to make criminally liable persons who negligently suffer prisoners in their custody to escape.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **JOHNSON** of California. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish someone would explain how broad that liability is.

Mr. **KEATING**. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman may I say that the present law makes it a criminal offense voluntarily to allow a prisoner to escape from custody. However, a case arose here in the District where a couple of prisoners were held on a murder charge and they got to playing cards with the guards and escaped through the alleged negligence of the guards. The guards, however, could not be prosecuted because it was not an intentional and a willful case. It has been held in Zimmerman against United States that the section relating to voluntary escape has no application to a negligent escape. It is in view of that decision that this bill has been introduced and has been passed in the Senate in exactly this form.

Mr. **JOHNSON** of California. I have in mind a prison break at the Rock in San Francisco where it was charged that some of the guards were negligent and as a result the prisoners overpowered them. Would that kind of case be covered by your amendment to the law?

Mr. **KEATING**. Yes. If it was held in an appropriate prosecution that the guards were negligent, they would be subject to the penalty provided in this bill.

Mr. **JOHNSON** of California. Then, in the trial of a man for the violation of this statute, the jury would determine whether he was negligent under all the circumstances.

Mr. **KEATING**. That is correct.

Mr. **JOHNSON** of California. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. **BROOKS**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this bill in any way apply to a State-enforcement official?

Mr. **KEATING**. It only has relation to Federal prisoners.

Mr. **BROOKS**. Could it be construed in any way to cover a State-enforcement official who in the course of his duties negligently releases a prisoner?

Mr. **KEATING**. Yes; if he had in custody a Federal prisoner, then it would apply to him, as I read the bill.

Mr. **BROOKS**. It would not apply to a State prisoner in any way?

Mr. **KEATING**. Not to a State prisoner, no. The process under which he has been taken into custody must have issued under the laws of the United States.

Mr. **MACKINNON**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill in its relation to court-martial prisoners?

Mr. **KEATING**. I should assume that prisoners in custody under court martial, if they are under military custody, would be governed by the Articles of

War, but if they are turned over to the custody of a Federal enforcement official, such as a marshal, then I assume this section would apply to them.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that explanation is satisfactory as applied to enlisted men charged with custody of court-martial prisoners.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think the apprehension entertained by the gentleman is unfounded. The bill is aimed at the gross negligence of Federal officials such as marshals and deputy marshals.

Mr. MACKINNON. I believe it may go further than that and apply to enlisted men who are charged with custody of prisoners committed to confinement by a military or naval court. In those circumstances the enlisted men are not professional jailers, their security facilities are not the best and the prisoners are allowed considerable freedom on the base or station. I believe the bill might apply to them.

Mr. JENNINGS. I do not think so.

Mr. MACKINNON. From my reading of the bill I believe it would apply to such situations.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am sure the gentleman has read the bill, but I believe he is wrong.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the explanation is satisfactory. The bill may not apply to such situations when we examine the provisions of other laws, but until the House can be assured on that point, I believe we should pass it. Therefore, in order to permit the House to be correctly informed on that particular point, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

AMENDING CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2109) to amend section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1003 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "In case of through service by air carriers and common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, it shall be the duty of the carriers parties thereto to establish just and reasonable rates, fares, or charges and just and reasonable classifications, rules, regulations, and practices affecting such rates, fares, or charges, or the value of the service thereunder, and if joint rates, fares, or charges shall have been established with respect to such through service, just, reasonable, and equitable divisions of such joint rates, fares, or charges as between the carriers participating therein."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "sentence" and insert "and third sentences," and on page 2, line 4, after the period and before the quotation marks insert the following: "Any air carrier, or any common carrier subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, which is participating in such through service and joint

rates, fares, or charges, shall include in its tariffs, filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board or the Interstate Commerce Commission, as the case may be, a statement showing such through service and joint rates, fares, or charges."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2086) to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 516) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator through the Public Buildings Administration be, and is hereby, authorized to furnish steam from the central heating plant for the use of the Daughters of the American Revolution on the property designated as square 173 in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the Daughters of the American Revolution agree to pay for the steam furnished at reasonable rates, not less than cost, as may be determined by the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency: *Provided further*, That the Federal Works Administrator, through the Public Buildings Administration, is authorized to prepare plans and specifications and to supervise and contract for the work necessary to connect with the Government mains and to receive payment from the Daughters of the American Revolution by the transfer of funds in advance to cover the cost of such work and services, including administrative expenses: *And provided further*, That there shall be no liability on the part of the Government on account of any damages that may accrue hereunder.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2086) was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SATURDAY LEAVE FOR RURAL CARRIERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1636) to amend section 6 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to the application of such section to rural carriers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute S. 547 for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 274, first session, is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph to section 6 under the title "Annual Leave":

"The authorized absence of a rural carrier on Saturdays which occur within or at the beginning or end of a period of sick or annual leave of five or more days' duration shall be without charge to such leave or loss of compensation: *Provided*, That only 4 days' continuous leave shall be necessary to permit the exclusion of Saturday as a charge against the carriers' leave when a holiday falls within the period of the leave."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect February 1, 1947.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain the provisions of this bill. In 1945 this House passed Public Law 134. Section 6 of that law provides that postmasters and employees shall be granted 15 days' leave of absence with pay, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, each fiscal year, and sick leave with pay at the rate of 10 days a year, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, to be cumulative.

Thereafter, on or about February 1 of this year, an opinion was rendered by the Comptroller General in which he holds that the provisions of this section 6 shall not apply to rural mail carriers. According to that opinion, rural mail carriers would be deprived of the benefits of section 6 of Public Law 134.

H. R. 1636 and S. 547 simply provide in clear and distinct language that our rural mail carriers shall be provided the same benefits of Public Law 134 as was intended by the Congress when that law was passed.

It will entail no further expenditure of moneys and has the approval of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget. I think H. R. 1636 makes the intent of Congress in this matter more clear than S. 547. For that reason I offer an amendment to the Senate bill, to include the provisions of H. R. 1636, making it unquestionable and clear that our rural mail carriers shall benefit by the provisions of section 6 of Public Law 134. I will read the provisions of H. R. 1636 and ask that they be annexed to S. 547 as an amendment.

That section 6 of Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 274, first session, is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph to section 6 under the title "Annual Leave":

"The authorized absence of a rural carrier on Saturdays which occur within or at the beginning or end of a period of sick or annual leave of five or more days' duration (or 4 days' duration if a holiday falls within or at the beginning or end of the period of sick or annual leave) shall be without charge to such leave or loss of compensation: *Provided*, That Saturdays occurring in a period of annual or sick leave taken in a smaller number of days may at the option of the carrier be charged to his accrued leave and when so charged he shall be paid for such absence."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect as of February 1, 1947.

There is no objection to this amendment or to the bill by the Department or the Bureau of the Budget.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. **STEVENSON**: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 6 of Public Law 134, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 274, first session, is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph to section 6 under the title 'Annual Leave':

"The authorized absence of a rural carrier on Saturdays which occur within or at the beginning or end of a period of sick or annual leave of five or more days' duration (or 4 days' duration if a holiday falls within or at the beginning or end of the period of sick or annual leave) shall be without charge to such leave or loss of compensation: *Provided*, That Saturdays occurring in a period of annual or sick leave taken in a smaller number of days may at the option of the carrier be charged to his accrued leave and when so charged he shall be paid for such absence."

"Sec. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect as of February 1, 1947."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCORPORATING THE AMVETS (AMERICAN VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1838) to incorporate the AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **COLE** of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is one of the very few instances where the Congress enacts a charter for a semipublic or nonprofit corporation. To the best of my recollection, this is the first instance of such a charter being approved for an organization composed of veterans of this war.

My reason for rising is to inquire of the Committee on the Judiciary if it has formulated any more or less flexible policy with regard to the issuance of Federal charters for veterans' organizations which might serve as a guide to other applicant organizations.

Mr. **RANKIN**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **COLE** of New York. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. **CASE**], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, is here. I believe he is ready to make some statement.

Mr. **CASE** of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the committee has no definite policy yet formulated with respect to this matter. It intends to and does consider each application on its merits. Naturally we must be satisfied after a very full examination that the purposes of the organization are sound, that its membership is representative of the group for which it seeks a charter, and that it is wholly patriotic and altruistic in its make-up. We have made that investigation in the present instance and feel that the organization has grown to the point in strength and suitability where its recognition is fully justified.

Mr. **RANKIN**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **COLE** of New York. I yield.

Mr. **RANKIN**. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that I introduced this same bill in the last Congress after carefully investigating this organization, the American Veterans of World War II. We are merely doing for them what we did for the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans. This is an organization comprised exclusively of veterans of World War II. I hope the gentleman will not object to it.

Mr. **COLE** of New York. I shall not, of course, object, but there are a number of bills pending before the Judiciary Committee for the incorporation of other veterans' organizations, and it was for the purpose of the Record and the information of the public through the Record that I thought it advisable for the Committee on the Judiciary to make an expression of its general policy with regard to applications of this sort.

Mr. **RANKIN**. I am not on the Judiciary Committee, but it is my experience that the Judiciary Committee considers and passes on each one of these bills on its merits.

Mr. **COLE** of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the Judiciary Committee—he may have answered it, but I would like it to be very clear. As I understand it, this is not intended to preempt the field of veterans' organizations representing World War II veterans. It will still be possible for other veterans' organizations representing World War II veterans which can qualify within the definition given by the gentleman from New Jersey also to get a charter?

Mr. **CASE** of New Jersey. I cannot, of course, speak for the other members of the committee, Mr. Speaker, but I can answer the precise question as to whether this preempts the field. My answer to that definitely is "No." Neither does it set a precedent for the granting of any other charter. Each one will have to be considered on its own merits.

Mr. **MCDONOUGH**. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this bill which will incorporate the American Veterans of World War II because of the worthy purposes for which this organization was founded and also because many of the original incorporators are from California and several of them from my district, the Fifteenth Congressional District of California.

The first national commander was Mr. Jack W. Hardy, of Los Angeles, Calif., a practicing attorney whom I have known for a number of years. The present California State commander, Mr. Frank Dee Scriven, is a constituent of mine.

It is singular and historic that the Amvets will be the first veterans' organization following World War II to be incorporated by the Congress. It is a highly patriotic organization dedicated to upholding and defending the basic truths and enduring principles on which this Nation was founded. The AMVETS have dedicated themselves to the fraternity and welfare of all veterans of World War II and to the service and best inter-

ests of the community, State, and Nation. There is no distinction between men and women veterans because both are permitted to be elected and hold office in the AMVETS.

Because of the lofty ideals and the high principles upon which the Amvets were originally organized, and as a co-sponsor of this bill, having introduced the first bill in the Eightieth Congress, H. R. 120, to incorporate the Amvets, I believe they are entitled to the recognition of the unanimous support of the House of Representatives to grant them the privilege of incorporating, and I therefore urge the passage of this bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following persons, to wit, Jack W. Hardy, 7421 Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.; Elmo Keel, 4085 Minnesota Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; William Enters, suite 1509-1511, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Gerald I. Cetrulo, 166 Bloomfield Avenue, Newark, N. J.; Norman Clock, 125 South Fourth Street, Reading, Pa.; Floyd Williams, C-2, 704 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.; Rev. Joseph T. O'Callaghan, United States Navy Department, Washington, D. C.; George R. Porter, 1730 South Adams Street, Fort Worth, Tex.; Robert E. McLaughlin, 800 South Washington Street, Alexandria, Va.; Ray Sawyer, Plymouth, N. H.; James C. Tate, 2 Wilton Road, R. F. D. No. 5, Alexandria, Va.; George E. Burke, 1126 Central Avenue, St. Petersburg, Fla.; A. Ronald Button, 6331 Hollywood Boulevard, Hollywood, Calif.; Americus Lambert, 515 West Seventh Street, Plainfield, N. J.; Emory S. McNider, Coffeyville, Ala.; Allen Hansen, 815 East Broadway, Tucson, Ariz.; Edward S. Shattuck, 1400 North Hobart Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.; Elvon L. Howell, 652 Gilpin Street, Denver, Colo.; William N. Welsh, 21 Bristol Street, West Haven, Conn.; Francis D. Odell, 18 Lawson Avenue, Claymont, Del.; George Lewis, 125 State Capitol, Atlanta, Ga.; Lee Witaski, 1438 Thorndale Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Clyde Iongstreth, Atlantic, Iowa; Harry N. Gillig, Jr., 612 Kansas Avenue, Topeka, Kans.; John H. Ostertag, 955 Charles Street, Louisville, Ky.; Otto E. Passman, 114-120 Walnut Street, post-office drawer 1833, Monroe, La.; Dr. G. E. Marrone, 610 Fairview Avenue, Frederick, Md.; Howard J. McDonald, 4 College Street, Lewiston, Maine; Edward J. Beauchamp, 4 College Street, Lewiston, Maine; Albert J. Reynolds, Tremont Temple Building, Boston, Mass.; Neil Holland, 401 Charlevoix Building, 2033 Park Avenue, Detroit, Mich.; Monte M. Korn, 18041 Washburn, Detroit, Mich.; Raymond D. Vosburgh, 222½ West Lewis Street, Mankato, Minn.; George R. Gess, box 47, Mount Olive, Miss.; Henry W. Simpson, room 500, 119 North Seventh Street, St. Louis, Mo.; R. C. Letcher, Billings Fire Department, Billings, Mont.; Dr. A. D. Faler, 1102 Medical Arts Building, Omaha, Neb.; Jay J. Strode, Wells, Nev.; N. L. Samaha, C-1, 1 Keeble Street, Plymouth, N. H.; William Hepp, 1918 Liberty Bank Building, Buffalo, N. Y.; Huston W. Galyen, 1121 Sixteenth Avenue North, Fargo, N. Dak.; Carl Freudenberg, 1298 Michigan Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio; Fred Milligan, attorney at law, Columbus, Ohio; Joseph D. Stafford, route 2, box 662, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Anthony R. McGrath, 609 Plaza Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Harry M. DeWitt, Jr., 2318 Fortieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Robert W. Donald, post-office box 2, Easley, S. C.; Dick Kelly, Shaw Insurance Co., Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Alex Bullocks, 1464 Washington Street, Memphis, Tenn.; Thomas J. Russell, Burlington, Vt.; John E. Fletcher, 806 North Eye Street, Tacoma, Wash.; R. L.

Stubbs, Professional Building, Fairmont, W. Va.; Walter L. Thompson, 1316 Lombard, Everett, Wash.; Robert A. Garrett, 163 Eccles Building, Ogden, Utah; Searcy Johnson, 805 Mercantile Building, Dallas, Tex.; Hampton C. Godbe, 116 P Street, Salt Lake City, Utah; Allen P. Solada, 311 Dauphin Building, Harrisburg, Pa.; George Vukmanic, 221 Martin Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Royce C. Granger, 102 East Eighteenth Street, Tulsa, Okla.; Charles E. Nassif, 1023 Thirteenth Street North, Fargo, N. Dak.; Paul D. Higgins, 104½ Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.; Edmund P. Radwan, 906 Broadway, Buffalo, N. Y.; Alexander J. Matturria, 234 Mount Prospect Avenue, Newark, N. J.; J. F. Roche, Bond Building, 1015 Elm Street, Manchester, N. H.; Kenneth A. Van Vorst, 114 East Bonanza Road, Las Vegas, Nev.; Julian C. Harvey, 1731 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo.; John Wesley, box 482, Picayune, Miss.; Claude C. Morgan, 810 Hammond Building, Detroit, Mich.; Edward A. Trudell, 26 Horan Way, Jamaica Plain, Mass.; Vincent C. Neeson, Labelle and Bellona, Ruxton, Baltimore, Md.; R. L. Huot, 106 Elm Street, Biddeford, Maine; John E. Sutherlin, Sutherlin Sales Co., Industries Building, New Orleans, La.; Thomas Wilkerson, 1600 Washington, Henderson, Ky.; John C. Junkins, Cherokee, Kans.; Dr. C. W. Hoffman, 1340 Forty-first Street, Des Moines, Iowa; Allen W. Jenkins, 1015 Cherry Street, Evansville, Ind.; Edwin I. Bruder, 6837 Clyde Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; Harry P. Orcutt, Fort Benning, Ga.; Arthur Di Vincent, post-office box 4579, Miami, Fla.; Maurice B. Marholin, 176 McClintock Road, New Britain, Conn.; Harry Steinberg, First National Bank Building, El Dorado, Ark.; Jess Curtiss, 807 North Third Street, Phoenix, Ariz.; Edward S. Coston, 69 Ninth Street North, Birmingham, Ala.; Anthony O. Jones, 315 Security Building, Phoenix, Ariz.; Frank Dee Scriven, 8474 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Allen C. Hessler, 1275 Clarkson Street, No. 4, Denver, Colo.; Michael Dzamki, 3912 First Street, East Chicago, Ind.; S. Howard Rudolph, Jr., Atlantic, Iowa; Fred K. Greer, 427 East Market Street, Princeton, Ky.; Roy Morgan, Winnfield, La.; James C. Wilt, 842 Columbia Avenue, Cumberland, Md.; Chester Modzelewski, 67 Davenport Street, Chicopee, Mass.; Arthur Madar, 9166 Yorkshire, Detroit, Mich.; John J. Clark, 257 Harrison Street, Biloxi, Miss.; William E. Blake, 73 Grey, Buffalo, N. Y.; Albert Geremia, room 303, 17 Exchange Street, Providence, R. I.; Frank E. Richter, 3, 12-14 West Sixth Street, Evansville, Ind.; Frank J. Ross, 1020 East Pleasant, Milwaukee, Wis.; Conrad K. Strauss, 160 Holland Avenue, Cowesett, R. I.; Paul S. Limerick, 456 Catalina, Webster Groves, Mo.; Raymond O'Brien, 22 North Ryan Street, Buffalo, N. Y.; Dallas P. Richeson, post-office box 2226, Phoenix, Ariz.; Fred Nimz, route 6, box 815A, Phoenix, Ariz.; Tom Bulman, 243 East Fifteenth Street, Tucson, Ariz.; Charles E. Brode, 15 North Lee Street, Cumberland, Md.; Clyde B. Blanton, 2095 Seventh Avenue North, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Floyd Cooper, 912 Polk Street, Amarillo, Tex.; Paul Moody, 548 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Oliver A. Farabee, Lexington, N. C.; Thad Males, 329 West Valerio Street, Santa Barbara, Calif.; and such persons who are members of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II) and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession of the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

SEC. 2. That a majority of the persons above named and other persons selected from among the membership of AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), an unincorporated association as set forth in section 1 hereof, met in national convention in Chicago, Ill., on October 12, 13, and 14, 1945, and then and there, by and through duly elected delegates representing 131 posts

throughout the United States adopted a national constitution, bylaws, and declaration of principles and duly elected national officers for said organization, all as set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, proceedings and debates of the Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, on November 6 and 7, 1945.

SEC. 3. That the purposes of this corporation shall be as follows:

(1) To preserve for ourselves and our posterity the great and basic truths and enduring principles upon which this Nation was founded.

(2) To maintain a continuing interest in the welfare and rehabilitation of the disabled veterans of World War II and to establish facilities for the assistance of all veterans and to represent them in their claims before the Veterans' Administration and other organizations without charge.

(3) To dedicate ourselves to the service and best interests of the community, State, and Nation, to the end that our country shall be and remain forever a whole, strong, and free Nation.

(4) To aid and encourage the abolition of prejudice, ignorance, and disease. To encourage universal exercise of the voting franchise, to the end that there shall be elected and maintained in public office men and women who hold such office as a public trust administered in the best interests of all the people.

(5) To advocate the development and means by which all Americans may become enlightened and informed citizens and thus participate fully in the functions of our democracy.

(6) To encourage and support an international organization of all peace-loving nations, to the end that not again shall any nation be permitted to breach their national peace.

(7) To continue to serve the best interests of our Nation in peace as in war.

(8) To develop to the utmost the human, mental, spiritual, and economical resources of our Nation.

(9) To perpetuate and preserve the friendships and comradeship born on the battle front and nurtured in the common experience of service to our Nation during time of war.

(10) To honor the memory of those men and women who gave their lives that a free America and a free world might live by the creation of living memorials in the form of additional educational, cultural, and recreational facilities.

(11) To operate as a corporation not for profit and that no part of the income or assets shall inure to the benefit of any of its members, directors, or officers, nor be distributable thereto otherwise than upon dissolution or final liquidation; and that such corporation is organized and shall be operated exclusively for charitable, educational, patriotic, and civic improvement purposes.

SEC. 4. That the corporation hereby created shall have the following powers: To have perpetual succession with power to sue and be sued in any court of competent jurisdiction; take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real and personal property by, a corporation operating in such State; to ordain and establish bylaws and regulations not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or any State thereof, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs; to use in carrying out its purposes such seals, emblems, and badges as it may lawfully adopt; to establish State and regional organizations and local

posts; to publish magazines, newspapers, or any other publications consistent with the purposes of the corporation and to do any and all such acts and things as may be necessary and proper to carry into effect the purposes of the corporation.

SEC. 5. (1) No part of the activities of the corporation shall consist of carrying on propaganda.

(2) The corporation and its officers and the members of its executive committee as such shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elective public office.

(3) The current executive committee consists of 40 members, namely, Ray Sawyer, Plymouth, N. H.; Jack W. Hardy, Title Guaranty Building, Los Angeles, Calif.; Albert J. Reynolds, 3117 Washington Street, Roxbury, Mass.; L. M. Hinshaw, box 558, Asheboro, N. C.; J. M. Crespi, Sims Building, 12 Auburn Avenue NE., Atlanta, Ga.; Arthur J. Madar, 9166 Yorkshire, Detroit 24, Mich.; Kenneth A. Anderson, 7166 South Penn Street, Denver, Colo.; Anthony O. Jones, 315 Security Building, Phoenix, Ariz.; Agnes Frazee, post-office box 751, Uniontown, Pa.; Floyd Williams, C-2, 704 North Monroe Street, Arlington, Va.; William Kipp, 1032 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; John J. Carney, 308 Leader Building, Cleveland, Ohio; Dr. John S. Weir, 618 South Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.; Rev. Sam Hill Ray, Loyola University, New Orleans, La.; Nathan Gordon, Little Rock, Ark.; Thad Males, 329 West Valerio Street, Santa Barbara, Calif.; Al Grossi, Farmington, Conn.; Harry M. De Witt, Jr., 2316 Fortieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; George E. Burke, 1126 Central Avenue, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Charles L. Crowley, 935 Oglethorpe Avenue, Atlanta, Ga.; L. Harlan Swisher, 306 Davidson Drive, Champaign, Ill.; Arthur Schnipper, 4334 Ivy Street, East Chicago, Ind.; Robert Buckmaster, 158 Woodstock Road, Waterloo, Iowa; William C. Moss, Bogalusa, La.; Edward J. Beauchamp, 163 Lisbon Street, Lewiston, Maine; Thomas Burke, 222 South Street, Fitchburg, Mass.; Milton F. Cooney, 55 Naomi Street, Pontiac, Mich.; Paul Limerick, 456 Catalina, Webster Groves, Mo.; Louis W. Zaris, 331 Guarantee Trust Building Atlantic City, N. J.; William Hepp, 176 Lafayette Street, Buffalo, N. Y.; J. C. Powell, box 830, Winston-Salem, N. C.; E. L. Halliwell, 455 Forest Avenue, Dayton, Ohio; K. L. Shirk, 33 North Duke Street, Lancaster, Pa.; Albert Geremia, 277 Webster Avenue, Providence, R. I.; Richard H. Dewey, 251 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.; Ivan Stone, 2708 West Lamar, Houston, Tex.; Dr. M. H. Seidner, 406 First Security Bank Building, Ogden, Utah; J. C. McCaughan, Jr., 1904 West Broad Street, Richmond, Va.; John E. Howell, Jr., 1110½ Seventeenth Street, Parkersburg, W. Va.; and Kenneth Kunde, Quonset Park, Oshkosh, Wis.

(4) The headquarters office and principal place of business of said corporation shall be located in Washington, D. C., but the activities of said organization, as set out herein, shall not be confined to the District of Columbia, but shall be conducted throughout the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

SEC. 6. Any American citizen shall be eligible for membership in the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II) who was regularly enlisted, inducted, or commissioned, and who was accepted for, or was on, active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, or our allies, on or after September 16, 1910, and who served between this date and the date of cessation of hostilities, as established by the Government of the United States. Service with the armed forces must have been terminated by honorable discharge or honorable reparation from the service: *Provided, however*, That persons otherwise eligible for membership who are on active duty or who must continue to serve after the

cessation of hostilities are also eligible for membership.

SEC. 7. (1) Each member of the said corporation shall have the right to one vote in the conduct of official business at the post level. Each post shall have the right to elect delegates to national conventions of the corporation, which delegates shall each exercise one vote in the conduct of business of the respective convention to which he is elected.

(2) The executive committee of the said corporation shall consist of one member duly elected to represent each department, and, in addition, all elective officers shall be members of the executive committee, ex officio.

SEC. 8. The said corporation may and shall acquire all of the assets of the existing unincorporated association known as AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II) upon discharge or satisfactory provisions for the discharge of all its liabilities.

SEC. 9. In the event of a final dissolution or liquidation of such corporation, and after the discharge or satisfactory provisions for the discharge of all its liabilities, the remaining assets of the said corporation shall be transferred to the Veterans' Administration to be applied to the care and comfort of disabled veterans of World War II.

SEC. 10. The corporation shall have the power to—

(1) Have succession by its corporate name; (2) Choose such officers, representatives, and agents as are necessary to carry out the purposes of the corporation;

(3) Contract and be contracted with;

(4) Transfer and convey all real or personal property;

(5) Borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure same by mortgage subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal or State laws.

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officials, representatives, and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

SEC. 12. The corporation shall maintain in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept services of processes for such corporation; and notice to or service upon such agent, or mail to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice or service upon the corporation.

SEC. 13. The following national officers of the said corporation shall be elected by the chosen delegates thereof in annual national conventions, each official delegate casting one vote, to wit: National commander; first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth national vice commander, one of whom shall be a woman; finance officer, adjutant, judge advocate, and provost marshal.

SEC. 14. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, executive committee, and committees having any of the authority of the executive committee; and shall keep at its registered office or principal office a record giving the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote; and permit all books and records of the corporation to be inspected by any member or his agent or his attorney for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

SEC. 15. The corporation shall not have or issue shares of stock, nor declare or pay dividends.

SEC. 16. No loan shall be made by the corporation to its officers or directors, or any of them, and any directors of the corporation who vote for or assent to the making of a loan or advance to an officer or director of a corporation, and any officer or officers participating in the making of any such loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

SEC. 17. The financial transactions of the corporation may be audited annually by the

General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositors, fiscal agents, and custodians.

The corporation shall reimburse the General Accounting Office for the full cost of any such audit of the financial transactions of such corporation as billed therefor by the Comptroller General, and the General Accounting Office shall deposit the sums so reimbursed into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 18. The corporation and its State, regional, and local subdivisions shall have the sole and exclusive right to have and use in carrying out its purposes the name AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), and such seals, emblems, and badges as the corporation may lawfully adopt.

SEC. 19. As a condition precedent to the exercise of any power or privilege herein granted or conferred AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II) shall serve notice on the secretary of state, in each State, the name and address of an authorized agent in such State upon whom legal process or demands against this corporation may be served.

SEC. 20. Such provisions, privileges, and prerogatives as have been granted heretofore to other national veterans' organizations by virtue of their being incorporated by Congress shall also be granted and accrue to AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II).

SEC. 21. The right to repeal, alter, or amend this act at any time is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 12, line 16, strike out "States;" and insert "States."

Page 14, lines 17 and 19, strike out the words "first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth" and insert "seven."

Page 14, line 19, strike out the word "commander" and insert the word "commanders."

Page 15, line 17, strike out the balance of page 15.

Page 16, strike out from lines 1 to 11, inclusive.

Page 16, line 12, strike out "18" and insert "17."

Page 16, line 17, strike out "19" and insert "18."

Page 16, line 24, strike out "20" and insert "19."

Page 17, line 2, strike out "shall also be" and insert "are hereby."

Page 17, line 4, strike out "21" and insert "20."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING BENEFITS OF MISSING PERSONS ACT TO CERTAIN INHABITANTS OF GUAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1368) to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are

entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) (3) of section 1 of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended by Public Law 408 of the Seventy-eighth Congress approved July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 679), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(3) civilian officers and employees of departments and civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam, during such time as they may be assigned for duty or serving outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, exclusive of part-time or intermittent employees or native labor casually hired on an hourly or per diem basis;"

SEC. 2. Appropriations which have been made or which may be made for the Navy Department and the naval service shall be available and may be used for the payment of such sums as may have accrued prior to July 21, 1944, to the credit of, and which remain unpaid to, civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam under the provisions and the authority of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as heretofore and herein amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARIFYING TIME OF APPOINTMENT OF REGULAR ARMY OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1605) to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.).

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to try to get some information. The bill speaks about the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army. Will the author of the bill tell me how many additional commissioned officers will be authorized?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that it provides for no additional officers. This merely amends the act passed last year under which the Army is authorized to eventually, in 1949, I believe it is, attain the Regular Army commissioned ranks to include an increase of 25,000. Since the act was passed 2,000 have been taken in and another increment will be taken in during the next few months. This merely fixes the time of appointment from which they take rank as between the day their nomination is sent to the Senate and the day it is approved.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is then to amend the act of December 28, 1945, in which there were provided additional officers in the Regular Army?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Our officer strength at the end of the war was sixteen-thousand-odd. Toward the end of the war we increased the Regular

Army commissions by eight-thousand-odd, to 25,000, of which approximately 4,000 officers went to the Air Corps and another 4,000 officers were allotted to the ground forces. That brought the Army up to approximately 25,000 Regular officers. There were 110,000 applications, roughly speaking, from among officers on temporary duty who desired Regular Army commissions. The Congress authorized an increase by 25,000 over a period of years so that ultimately we will have officers to the number of around 45,000. Those men are being taken in by increments. About 2,000 have been taken in so far and another 2,000 will be taken in this spring.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman know how many officers are presently in the Army? How many are in line for discharge?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The present number of Regular Army officers is 16,000, plus 8,000, plus 2,000. An increment of 2,000 has been taken in. It is roughly 26,000.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. According to the testimony given before the Military Affairs Committee, when we established the Army at 1,070,000, General Paul testified they wanted 100,000 officers and 970,000 men. At the present time they are carrying under the budget 146,000 officers and plan on that number for the next year. That includes warrant officers and nurses.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes; that will go to the figure announced by General Paul on July 1.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. One hundred thousand?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I may say in conclusion that I have been somewhat concerned about the slowness of the armed forces in getting some of its officers separated, especially in the higher levels. We find on examining the records that many of these officers are waiting around hoping to get a discharge for disability reasons and on a pension. I understand that the reasons for disability and the pension cannot be reviewed for 15 years. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is rather disturbing to one looking at the number of officers who are waiting to get out on account of disability of some kind so that they may be discharged from the Army and draw a pension for the rest of their lives. The records will show a large waiting list, all hopeful that their physical condition will warrant a pension on discharge; and this is not subject to review for 15 years.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is correct. I sympathize with the gentleman. This bill has to do with those who are in the future named as Regular Army officers up to the grade of major and has to do with the date they are nominated.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective December 28, 1945, the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.), is further amended by inserting after section 8 thereof an additional section as follows:

"SEC. 9. For the purpose of administering the provisions of this act, the date of nomination by the President if the Senate is in session, or if the Senate is in recess the date of a recess appointment by the President, shall be considered as the date or time of appointment in determining eligibility for appointment, permanent grade in which appointed, date of rank in such grade, period of service to be credited under section 5 hereof, and eligibility for promotion of each person appointed as a commissioned officer of the Regular Army under the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That no person appointed under the provisions of this act shall be entitled, by reason of such appointment, to any pay or allowances for any period prior to the date of acceptance of such appointment."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO GRANT TO COUNTY OF PITTSBURG, OKLA., A PERPETUAL EASEMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1807) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the County of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant and convey to the County of Pittsburg, State of Oklahoma, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway upon and over a strip of land containing three and twenty-two one-hundredths acres, being a portion of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla., the metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 20A OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2331) to amend section 20A of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill involves a subject matter which is altogether too important and too complicated to justify consideration on the Consent Calendar, and therefore I object.

COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2336) to amend section 327 of the Communica-

tions Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Coast Guard radio stations for the reception and transmission of commercial messages.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 47, sec. 327), is hereby amended by inserting "(a)" after "327." and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury, in the case of radio stations and apparatus owned by the United States and under the control of the Coast Guard, shall have the same authority as that granted to the Secretary of the Navy by subsection (a) in the case of radio stations and apparatus owned by the United States and under the control of the Navy Department, such authority to be exercised subject to the same terms, conditions, and limitations as are prescribed in subsection (a)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2758) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 686), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Sec. 4. (a) The Administrator, and any Civil Aeronautics Administration employee appointed to protect life and property on the airport, when designated by the Administrator, is hereby authorized and empowered (1) to arrest under a warrant within the limits of the airport any person accused of having committed within the boundaries of the airport any offense against the laws of the United States, or against any rule or regulation prescribed pursuant to this act; (2) to arrest without warrant any person committing any such offense within the limits of the airport, in his presence; or (3) to arrest without warrant within the limits of the airport any person whom he has reasonable grounds to believe has committed a felony within the limits of the airport.

"(b) Any individual having the power of arrest as provided in subsection (a) of this section may carry firearms or other weapons as the Administrator may direct or by regulation may prescribe.

"(c) The United States Park Police may, at the request of the Administrator, be assigned by the Director of the National Park Service, in his discretion, subject to the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to patrol any area of the airport, and any members of the United States Park Police so assigned are hereby authorized and empowered to make arrests within the limits of the airport for the same offenses, and in the same manner and circumstances, as is provided in this section with respect to employees designated by the Administrator.

"Sec. 5. Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any rule or regulation prescribed under this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

"SEC. 6. The officer on duty in command of those employees designated by the Administrator as provided in section 4 may accept deposit of collateral from any person charged with the violation of any rule or regulation prescribed under this act, for appearance in court or before the appropriate United States commissioner; and such collateral shall be deposited with the United States commissioner at Alexandria, Va.

"SEC. 7. The Administrator may enter into agreements with the State of Virginia, or with any political subdivision thereof, for such municipal services as the Administrator shall deem necessary to the proper and efficient government of the airport, and he may, from time to time, agree to modifications in any such agreement: *Provided, however*, That where the charge for any such service is established by the laws of the State of Virginia, the Administrator may not pay for such service an amount in excess of the charge so established. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the making of payment for services under any such agreement."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2759) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill likewise is of such a complicated nature as to require a more extended explanation than can be had on the Consent Calendar, and therefore I object.

MILITARY OR NAVAL SERVICE CREDIT IN HOMESTEAD ENTRIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 603) to amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for military or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 1 and 2 of the act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II," approved September 27, 1944, are amended to read as follows:

"That any person who has served or may serve in the military or naval forces of the United States, or in the United States merchant marine, for a period of at least 90 days during World War II, and is honorably discharged or has been separated from the United States merchant marine, and who makes homestead entry subsequent to such discharge or separation, shall have the period of his military or naval service or service in the United States merchant marine, not exceeding 2 years, construed to be equivalent to residence and cultivation upon the land for the same length of time. In the case of any such person who served in the military or naval forces, credit shall be allowed for 2 years' military or naval service (1) if such person is discharged on account of wounds received or disability incurred in the line of duty; or (2) if such person is regularly discharged and subsequently is furnished hospitalization or is awarded compensation by the Government on account of such wounds or disability. No patent shall issue to any

such person who has not resided upon his homestead and otherwise complied with the provisions of the homestead laws for a period of at least 1 year. No person shall be ineligible for the benefits provided by this act by reason of being married; and, where both husband and wife are entitled to such benefits, the aggregate of their periods of service may be counted as the period of service of one of them for purposes of this section.

"SEC. 2. In the case of any person who would be entitled to a homestead under the provisions of this act, his or her surviving spouse, or in the case of the death or marriage of such surviving spouse, then his or her minor orphan children by guardian duly appointed and officially accredited at the Department of the Interior, shall be entitled to all the benefits enumerated in section 1 of this act. An entry made by such surviving spouse or guardian shall be subject to the provisions contained in section 1 respecting compliance with the provisions of the homestead laws for a period of at least 1 year."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of such act approved September 27, 1944, is amended by inserting the words "or service in the United States merchant marine" after the words "military or naval service."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II,' approved September 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 747), as amended June 25, 1946 (60 Stat. 308, 43 U. S. C., sec. 279), is amended to read as follows:

"That any person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States for a period of at least 90 days at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and is honorably discharged from the military or naval forces and who makes homestead entry subsequent to such discharge shall have the period of such service, not exceeding 2 years, construed to be equivalent to residence and cultivation upon the land for the same length of time. Credit shall be allowed for 2 years' service to any person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the above period (1) if such person is discharged on account of wounds received or disability incurred during the above period in the line of duty, or (2) if such person is regularly discharged and subsequently is furnished hospitalization or is awarded compensation by the Government on account of such wounds or disability. When the homestead entry is made by a husband or wife whose spouse is entitled to any service credit under this section, such credit shall, with the consent of the spouse entitled thereto, be available to the husband or wife making the entry, in addition to any service credit to which he or she individually may be entitled under this section. No patent shall issue to any such person who has not resided upon his homestead and otherwise complied with the provisions of the homestead laws for a period of at least 1 year: *Provided*, That no person who has served in the military or naval forces of the United States for a period of at least 90 days at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and is honorably discharged shall be disqualified from making homestead entry or from any other benefits of this act merely by reason of not having reached the age of 21 years."

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act (43 U. S. C., sec. 280) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The surviving spouse or the minor children, as hereinafter provided, shall be entitled (1) in case of the death of any per-

son as the result of wounds received or disability incurred in line of duty while serving in the military or naval forces of the United States during the period specified in section 1, to credit for 2 years' residence and cultivation on a homestead entry, or (2) in the case of the death of any person after performing service that would be a basis for credit under section 1 of this act, to the amount of credit which would have been allowable to such person. The credit provided by this section shall be available to the surviving spouse, or, in the case of the death or marriage of the surviving spouse, to the minor children by a guardian duly appointed and officially accredited at the Department of the Interior. An entry made by such surviving spouse or guardian shall be subject to the provisions contained in section 1 respecting compliance with the provisions of the homestead laws for a period of at least 1 year."

"SEC. 3. Section 4 of such act (43 U. S. C., sec. 282) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. For the period of 10 years following September 27, 1944, on the revocation of any order of withdrawal or the filing of a plat of survey or resurvey opening lands to entry, the order or notice taking such action shall provide for a period of not less than 90 days before the date on which it otherwise becomes effective, in which persons of the classes entitled to credit for service, under the provisions of this act, shall have a preferred right of application under the homestead or desert land laws, or the Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended (59 Stat. 467, 43 U. S. C., sec. 682a), subject to the requirements of applicable law, except as against the prior existing valid settlement rights and preference rights conferred by existing laws or as against equitable claims subject to allowance and confirmation, and except where a revocation of an order of withdrawal is made in order to assist in a Federal land program other than one authorized by the homestead or desert land laws or by said Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938, as amended. During the same period if the Secretary of the Interior shall, without a prior petition thereof, classify any land as being suitable for disposition under the said Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938, as amended, the order of classification shall provide a similar preference right of application under that act, subject to the exceptions contained in this section."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1099) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title to the lands and interest in lands, together with the improvements thereon, and proceeds from rents and sales therefrom, which have been acquired by the United States under authority of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 200), the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115), and of section 55 of title I of the act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 750, 781), lying and situate within the State of Minnesota, administrative jurisdiction over which has heretofore been transferred by the President from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Interior by Executive Order No. 7868, dated April 16, 1938, is hereby declared to be held in trust by the United States of America for

the use and benefit of the Minnesota Chipewewa Tribe, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to proclaim such lands as an addition to the White Earth Indian Reservation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT HALL RESERVATION, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1584) authorizing the erection and operation of a memorial museum and shop on the Fort Hall Reservation, Idaho.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, from any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$85,000, for the purpose of erecting a memorial museum, in commemoration of old Fort Hall, and a shop for the sale of Indian handicrafts, on land set aside for that purpose by the business council of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation. The museum and shop shall be supervised, managed, and controlled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$85,000" and insert "\$150,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARKETING OF VIRGINIA SUN-CURED TOBACCO

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 152) relating to the marketing of Virginia sun-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill involves a change in policy, and it should not be on the Consent Calendar. I therefore object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I would like to state to the gentleman from New Jersey that this legislation does not in any way change the policy of the tobacco legislation.

Mr. KEAN. It brings in a new type of tobacco.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It only covers four or five counties in Virginia, chiefly in Mr. SMITH's district, where they raise dark fire-cured tobacco, and the growers, to come under the tobacco program, ask for the two-thirds allotment that the other growers produce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

CLOTHING ALLOWANCE OF ENLISTED MEN OF MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1375) to further amend section 10 of the Pay

Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby further amended by changing the last paragraph of the said section to read as follows:

"Hereafter the President may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing which shall be furnished annually to enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and he may prescribe the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted men in any case in which clothing is not so furnished to them."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARMY MAIL CLERKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2339) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress approved August 21, 1941, chapter 392 (55 Stat. 656), be amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the bills eligible to be called on the Consent Calendar today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a letter from A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, to Senator KNOWLAND, of California; and further to extend my remarks and include a statement by Mr. A. F. Whitney, who was the first leading labor official in the country to speak out against the cuts in the appropriations for the Department of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

RELIEF AND BETTER SAFETY CONDITIONS FOR MINES

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the Nation was shocked with the great loss of lives in the tragic explosion in the No. 5 Coal Mine at Centralia, Ill., which caused the death of 111 miners. The death of these men leaves 97 widows and 78 dependent children to face a sad and difficult future. These men lost

their lives while employees of the Federal Government.

The Supreme Court confirmed this statement when it said in a recent decision with reference to the authority of the Government in dealing with the coal strike:

Congress intended that by virtue of Government seizure, a mine should become, for purposes of production and operation, a Government facility in as complete a sense as if the Government held full title and ownership.

Mr. Speaker, when the Government took over these mines a safety code was agreed upon between the Government and the representatives of the United Mine Workers. This code laid down certain safety standards to protect the lives and safety of the coal miners. It was a binding contract signed by Mr. Krug, representing the Government, and Mr. Lewis, representing the miners. Investigations of the Centralia coal mine in November 1946 disclosed that the mine was in an unsafe and dangerous condition. In fact, the Federal inspectors reported some 50 violations, all of which were dangerous to the safety of the miners and called upon the Federal Government to take notice thereof and to correct such conditions. The Government failed to correct these conditions and on March 25, 1947, this disastrous explosion occurred with this great loss of lives.

In the Straight Creek Coal Co., Kentucky, mine disaster which occurred on December 26, 1945, it was practically impossible to rescue all of the miners and that mine was sealed leaving 21 men dead in the mine. This disaster left 23 widows and 69 dependent children. The bodies of the 21 men have never been removed from that mine.

By reason of these two disasters there are left a total of 267 widows and dependent children.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to bring some meager relief to these families so that their widows may carry on with proper food, clothing, medical care, and educational opportunities for their children, I have introduced a bill asking for an appropriation for \$735,000, which equals the amount assessed in fines against the United Mine Workers organization, providing that this amount of money which comes to the Federal Government by reason of such fines be set up in a special fund to be administered on the basis of need, to provide relief and aid to the widows and dependent children of these two mine disasters, to be administered by the Social Security Administration. While this seems a rather large amount of money it, in fact, only utilized the use of money which comes to the Federal Government from the United Mine Workers organization, money contributed by the various coal miners of the Nation. It is not a large amount when you take into consideration the needs of 267 dependents. With the best administration and care it will probably all be expended within the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has given in relief to other nations billions of dollars. In fact, over \$1,500,000,000 is requested and earmarked for relief to the people of foreign countries for the

coming year. There is recommended an additional gift of \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey.

This bill simply seeks to set aside money contributed over the years by the men in the mines who dug the coal, to offer some meager relief to the unfortunate widows and children of their fellow workers who lost their lives because they worked under hazardous conditions, which conditions were a violation of the contract on the part of the Federal Government in not correcting these dangerous conditions in the Centralia mine and upon the part of the mining company in not removing the dangerous hazards and conditions in the Straight Creek Co. mine in Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that it in no way affects or includes the \$10,000 fine assessed against Mr. John L. Lewis. This bill does not touch or include that personal proposition in any way. It proposes to place this money in the administration of the Social Security Board, which will cause a study to be made of the financial conditions of the various widows and families of the men who lost their lives, and aid will be rendered on the basis of need in an effort to help provide food, medical care, and other necessities of life which will help the widows to properly take care of the children under 18 years of age so that they may have the benefit of a high-school education where desired.

I decided to introduce this legislation solely from a humanitarian standpoint. There are very few miners in my congressional district, and there are 111 less miners since this tragedy happened. I do believe that the Government can afford in these two particular instances to render the aid provided for in this proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to include in the Record the list of fatal and nonfatal accidents occurring in the coal mines during the years 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946.

This will give you an idea of the unsafe working conditions and the great loss of life and limb endured by the miners.

This will show that there was a total of 322,637 accidents of which 6,229 were fatal, leaving thousands of widows and orphans.

The figures show that every man who goes to work in a coal mine, considering the number employed, will be hurt or killed in a period of 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, this raises the question and points to the absolute necessity that the Federal Government and the States cooperating must speedily enact such laws and enforce them as will bring greater safety to the miners of the Nation in the future.

The following is a tabulation of lost-time injuries and fatalities at the United States coal mines in the past 5 years:

1942	
Fatal accidents.....	1,471
Nonfatal accidents.....	69,564
Total accidents.....	71,035
Permanent total disabilities.....	65
Permanent partial disabilities.....	2,045
Seven major disasters with toll of 132 lives.	

1943	
Fatal accidents.....	1,451
Nonfatal accidents.....	64,594
Total accidents.....	66,045
Permanent total disabilities.....	26
Permanent partial disabilities.....	1,287
Eight major disasters with loss of 175 lives.	

1944	
Fatal accidents.....	1,294
Nonfatal accidents.....	65,900
Total accidents.....	67,194
Four major disasters, 94 lives lost.	

1945	
Fatal accidents.....	1,079
Nonfatal accidents.....	59,350
Total accidents.....	60,429
Five major disasters, 68 lives lost.	

1946	
Fatal accidents.....	974
Nonfatal accidents.....	57,000
Total accidents.....	57,974
Two major disasters, 27 lives lost.	

The fine of \$735,000 was assessed against the United Mine Workers of America upon the finding of the majority of the Supreme Court that the miners were employees of the Federal Government. In other words, it cost the United Mine Workers of America \$735,000 merely because they were Government employees. Surely, if the fact of Government employment entails such a heavy responsibility these persons should be entitled to some of the protection and benefits afforded every other Government employee.

If a regular Government employee loses his life in the course of Federal Government employment the Government pays his widow \$61.25 per month during the remainder of her life or until she remarries. If she has dependent children under 18 years of age, each dependent child receives \$17.50 a month, if the employee has been earning a salary of \$175 per month.

When you compare the coal miners who were in fact Government employees in the Centralia mine with this allowance granted regular Government employees, it seems to me to completely prove the justice of setting aside the coal miners' own money to help provide sustenance and relief for their widows and children.

I repeat the United States Supreme Court in the decision assessing this \$735,000 fine seemed clearly to prove the justice of this reasoning when it said, "Congress intended that by virtue of Government seizure, a mine should become, for purposes of production and operation, a Government facility in as complete a sense as if the Government held full title and ownership."

Mr. Speaker, I understand a bill has been introduced providing that Federal inspectors may close down mines when they find that safety conditions demand it.

I believe it is the duty of the Congress to enact legislation along this line and other legislation to insure more safe working conditions. It is to be hoped that out of this recent tragedy at Centralia, Ill., in the loss of 111 miners that

the miners of the Nation will be benefited in the future through legislative action that will force and compel better working and better safety conditions throughout the coal mines of America.

Such legislation is imperative not only from the humanitarian standpoint but from an economic standpoint as well. One of the greatest natural resources left in America today is the coal in the earth. Billions of tons of coal, worth countless billions of dollars, coal enough to supply the United States for thousands of years in the future is one of our priceless great natural resources left.

Mr. Speaker, a doubt has been raised whether we have enough oil in this country to successfully defend our Nation if, unfortunately, another war should come upon us, but we do have the coal which can be converted into gas for power and heat, to gasoline and other synthetics, much of which we must depend upon in the future.

Unless better safety conditions are provided, the sons of miners and others will not go down into the earth to bring up the coal. No other group of men in the factories of the Nation are permitted to work in the face of such hazards to life and limb as are the miners.

They have mined the coal which has powered our great steel and industrial developments, which has lighted and illuminated the countryside through rural electrification, lighted and powered the great cities through public utilities, that has brought untold comfort to millions of our people. They have furnished the power that has largely developed our great railway and transportation system. Our industrial progress in the future depends more upon coal than upon any other natural resource. The steel industry is basic and fundamental to the success of the industry of this Nation. Coal must power the great steel industry and other industries of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the miners of our Nation, as to their safety at their work, have been too long overlooked. Through their sweat and toil they have made a great and tremendous contribution to the development of our Nation and to the comfort of our people. There must be better safety conditions thrown around them to induce their sons and other young men to work in the mines of this country. I repeat, it is an economic problem as well as a humanitarian problem. Unless better conditions are brought about, this great wealth hoarded under the ground so necessary to the future development of our Nation will not be brought to the surface in sufficient quantities to drive America forward to its greatest destiny in the future.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I ask the gentleman to yield for information. Do these miners have any special insurance or special fund through the United Mine Workers, or through some insurance company of their own, for their protection in accidents of this kind?

Mr. VURSELL. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I hope they have. I hope that these widows and orphans may be administered to through that fund. That fund was established in the bargaining, when the Government seized the mines, between the Federal Government, represented by Mr. Krug, and by Mr. Lewis for the mine workers. The plan called for the administration of the fund, I think, by a committee of three which was to be appointed. That was in May, almost a year ago. Mr. Krug was so busy in the campaign out West and then out inspecting our possessions in the Philippines later, that he had never found time to appoint the Government member that the safety code and agreement said should be appointed. I understand that tomorrow, after this thing has happened, perhaps this committee will be organized. There has been considerable money impounded. I do not know how that money is to be used.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to say I am thoroughly in accord with the statements of the gentleman from Illinois and I just merely asked the question for my own information.

Mr. VURSELL. It is entirely possible that something might be worked out through this fund, that would make legislation of this kind unnecessary. I do not think, however, that it would go that far. But may I go further and say that these miners did have workmen's compensation under the Illinois law, but they paid for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDONOUGH). Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is recognized for 12 minutes.

THE PRESIDENT'S JEFFERSON DAY ADDRESS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's Jefferson Day address was in line with traditional democratic formula—claim credit for all the good and blame somebody else for all the bad.

His address was noticeably lacking in comment on the strike of telephone workers—the first general strike of telephone workers in our history—and the dismal failure of his administration to prevent this drag on the Nation's economy.

Nor did he shed any light on the failure of his administration to save the country from the latest walkout of soft coal miners—a strike that has begun to slow down steel and other industries.

These two paralyzing blows to our Nation's economy did not share the President's glowing tributes to his administration, in whose hands is the machinery for mediation and corrective action.

Mr. Truman has been very quiet of late about labor legislation, though we have strike after strike. Some weeks ago he submitted some puny proposals for solution of a situation that requires two-fisted handling. Oh, yes, he asked for a commission to study the problem, when across the country there is a roar for constructive action.

The American people know that the Republican Congress they voted for last November has not been idle in the face of management-labor disputes that end

in business-paralyzing strikes that cut down the production of goods and thus give inflation another whirl with everybody a loser.

Hundreds of witnesses from labor, management, and the public generally have been heard by congressional committees. Congress will pass in two or three weeks a constructive, fair, labor bill to establish sensible relationship between employers and labor unions.

Then President Truman will have his opportunity to sign or veto it. Then he will have his opportunity officially to pass upon comprehensive legislation to curb the strife between management and organized labor that was generated by the New Dealers' un-American labor laws.

President Truman also will have an opportunity soon to sign or veto a bill from the Republican Congress to scotch the portal-to-portal pay racket. Everybody remembers how these portal suits piled up in the courts to the fantastic total of more than \$5,000,000,000. The people know that it was the swift action of the Republican Congress that slammed the brakes on those monstrous suits by pushing along legislation toward Mr. Truman's desk.

Yes, the American people are sick and tired of employer-union labor disputes that tie up the Nation's economy and give aid and comfort to the Communists.

We all have a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The public will not stand for any headstrong minority groups hamstringing their happiness.

Mr. Truman used the \$100-a-plate Jefferson Day dinner of his partisans to declaim on the pending aid for Greece and Turkey. The American people know how to view that subject, too.

They know that the United States since its establishment has been the beacon light of oppressed peoples everywhere. The United States always has been and always will be kindly disposed toward small countries when they are shoved around by big nations.

American food for starving peoples is not a partisan issue.

It is a Republican Congress that is putting through the measure for aid to Greece and Turkey, and we shall continue to cooperate with the Democratic administration in presenting a united, American front to the world.

President Truman consulted Republican as well as Democratic leaders before he submitted the recommendation for help to Greece and Turkey. I hope that his remarks before the partisan, politics-minded Jefferson Day Democratic fundraisers, were not meant to be a political gesture. Let us keep politics out of the Greece-Turkey bill.

The American people know how to evaluate the purely political parts of Mr. Truman's amazing address—and virtually all of it was old-fashioned politics. They know that he spoke before a partisan audience, many of whom no doubt still think that the Democratic Party received a vote of confidence in last November's election, and not the landslide that hit them.

Of course, Mr. Truman would like to claim that his administration is responsible for the removal of shackles from

our free competitive business. Since the grand jury of the people spoke last November he has been making some selective appropriations of Republican doctrines. But Mr. Truman's repentance is too little and too late.

The American people already have assigned to the Republican Party the job of casting out of the Government New Dealers who still yearn to control the people from cradle to grave.

Mr. Truman was late, very late in recognizing what the Republican Party has been proclaiming for years—that Communists and other alien-minded rascals have infested the administrative branch. The people have given the Republican Party a mandate to clean house.

The Republican Congress has begun to do so and wants the cooperation of the executive branch in doing a thorough job.

The President's proposal that a loyalty test be given to Government employees was applauded by the people generally. Extremists in the Democratic Party—the tail that wags the dog—protested through their usual method of indirection and fault-finding on the way the test is to be made.

Presumably, these torpedo tactics by the left-wing Democrats have caused some wobbling by the Presidential brain trust; for, Mr. Truman, subsequent to his broadside against Communists and other subversives, was revealed to have written a letter to former Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania, saying the country was perfectly safe against communism and that the subject was a mere bug-a-boo.

The President, in his February 28 letter to Mr. Earle, an ardent foe of communism, went on to say that he did not believe the time ever would come when anyone—mark you he said anyone—will want to overthrow the American Government.

That letter was disheartening to the country. It raised doubt on just how far Mr. Truman will go in carrying out his announced program to rid the temples of Government of disloyal employees.

Mr. President, when you adopt a Republican campaign promise such as this one to toss the commies out of your administration, we Republicans hope that you will embrace it wholeheartedly.

There will be no doubt in the minds of the people on what will be done about disloyal employees when the Republican President moves into the White House in January 1949.

Now, on the Federal budget and tax reduction. The American people know that for years the Republican Party, though having a minority in Congress, have battled for drastic reduction in Federal expenditures. Now that we have been voted control of Congress, we are doing something about it.

The country also knows how vigorously Mr. Truman has protested against cutting his budget estimates for the next fiscal year. He made the amazing argument in his Jefferson Day address that he had cut the budget to the lowest total and that it was the duty of Congress to take it as he submitted it.

Every schoolboy knows that the Constitution specifically places control of

the Nation's purse strings in the hands of Congress; also that all revenue measures shall originate in the House of Representatives. The former rubber-stamp New Deal Congresses were used to abdicate their responsibilities. This Republican Congress will not abdicate its constitutional duties.

The automatic effect of Mr. Truman's persistent insistence that Congress approve his budget as presented has been a signal to bureaucrats to charge upon Congress with pleas that their pet money-spending projects be spared from the Republicans' economy ax.

In fact, there has been a reluctance of administration employees to cooperate with the Republican Congress in searching out the deadwood in the administrative branch. And the New Deal Democrats in Congress have done nothing except balk at every move we Republicans make to slash the budget. The record shows efforts from the Democratic side to load up the appropriation bills.

But we Republicans are driving ahead with our economy program as ordered by the people. If President Truman in his Jefferson Day address had given a signal to his Democratic officeholders—and they were numerous in the assemblage—to help reduce appropriations to the absolute minimum necessary to carry on the Government, then he would have made a worth-while contribution.

He is going to have his opportunity, officially, to pass upon the budget slashing now on in Congress. The appropriation bills are beginning to roll. Soon they will be reaching his desk. Then it will be up to him to sign or veto.

Yes; records are being made. The Republican Congress will make its record and when the session ends the people will judge whether the Republican Party has been true to its trust.

President Truman seems to be doing a little wobbling on tax reduction. It will be recalled that in his January message to Congress he said that currently high taxes were necessary for the security of the Nation. He said that it was no time to cut taxes.

He told press and radio reporters last month that he still stood on his January message. But in his Jefferson Day address—to his partisan followers and after the country applauded the Republican House-passed tax-cutting bill—Mr. Truman had this to say:

At a proper time I will support tax reduction and tax readjustment designed to reduce the burden and to adjust the burden to the needs of a peacetime economy.

Please note that phrase: "At a proper time." Why, praise be, now is the accepted time. Now is the time to get our Government structure on an efficient peacetime basis.

The time is rotten ripe for reduction in bureaucracy and for lightening the tax burden that the New Dealers, with their crackpot schemes, piled onto the people in their tax, spend, and elect program. Mr. President, Senator BYRD, of your own party, says there are more people on your executive branch pay roll now than there were at the war's end.

Obviously, that is exclusive of the armed forces, which we all know have been reduced.

The American people last fall indicated what they thought of the way their hard-earned money was being soaked up by taxeaters in Washington. And when the Republican Party took over control of Congress, a great sigh of relief went up from the people.

New Dealers have been on top a long time. Now it is open season for them. Mr. Truman presumably thinks that the proper time to cut Government expenditures substantially, and taxes, is next year—an election year. He may think that is political timing.

But if he does, and the evidence seems to indicate that he does think next year would be a good time to put the ax earnestly to the taxeaters in Washington, he is sadly mistaken. The right thing to do is to cut expenditures to the bone and lighten the tax burden on the people now.

Yes, the Republican Party pledged tax reduction. It already has put through the House a fair tax-reduction bill. Congress will soon send a tax-cutting bill to President Truman and he then will have his opportunity to act officially—to sign or veto.

It is going to be very interesting to see how this matter of sign or veto works out on a lot of measures.

With a show of pride the President told his Jefferson Day admirers that there would be a surplus in the Federal Treasury at the end of the present fiscal year. Smilingly, he remarked in an aside that the Republican Party could claim no credit for the oncoming surplus of revenue over expenditures.

Again praise be. Mr. President, the common man knows what happened last November, because he did it. He knows that the rain of ballots in repudiation of your administration electrified the Nation and gave free men a chance to breathe again, knowing that the GOP economy ax soon would be swinging.

While the Republican Congress is perfecting its legislation on labor, budget-slashing and tax relief—and many other necessary measures—it is to be expected that the Democrats, too, would have a breathing spell—time to whistle as they go through their endless political graveyard.

And among the thinking, patriotic common people of our country there must be much curiosity today over whether the effected honeymoon between the Republican Congress and the Democratic President that was predicted by some last January, is ever going to take place.

I am wondering whether the bridegroom, faced by the issue of sign or veto, will show up for the wedding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDONOUGH). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

EXPORT LICENSES TO RUSSIAN-OCCUPIED TERRITORY

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it is about time that the President of the United

States and the State Department began to move in one direction instead of in two opposite directions.

We have under consideration here in Congress a proposal to send a certain amount of aid to Greece and Turkey. The thing that has impressed me in connection with this situation and which the State Department does not seem to have grasped, is that there is planned for the next 3 or 4 months the shipment of \$50,000,000 worth of food and supplies to Poland, \$50,000,000 to Yugoslavia, \$22,000,000 to the Ukraine, and \$11,000,000 to White Russia.

These shipments are to be made from this country and out of our stocks, although a major part of the payment for them would come out of the funds that were appropriated in one way or another to UNRRA. All would require an export license.

Why we should be sending things to those places when Russia is back of the guerilla warfare in Greece; when Russia violates her Potsdam and Yalta agreement repeatedly; when she fails, as she agreed, to have a free election in Poland and Yugoslavia and fails to live up to her agreements of the lend-lease program—it seems to me that our diplomatic representatives should tell Mr. Stalin that unless these irregular practices cease; unless we have free elections in Yugoslavia and Poland and unless Russia ceases to foment trouble along the northern Greek border, that it would be impossible, longer, for us to permit export licenses to be issued for such things as this.

It seems to me that it is about time that we began to play our cards. If we were to play our cards, the Greek and Turkish situation would rapidly clear up and we would be able to solve our foreign problem in a much more satisfactory way.

I do not make this statement critical of General Marshall because I do not believe that he has had an opportunity to go into a lot of these matters as he should, and which I know he will when he gets around to it, but am trying to help solve the terrible situation that we are in at this time.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Did I understand the gentleman to say that those programs were UNRRA programs?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I thought UNRRA was supposed to end on March 31.

Mr. TABER. UNRRA probably has a billion dollars' worth of stuff to ship yet, and on top of that they require export licenses from the United States to do it. We are sending this to Soviet-controlled and occupied countries at the very time that they are a menace to the peace of the world.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I agree with what the gentleman is saying 100 percent.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Under the old lend-lease program, since July of last year we have sent to Russia proper \$45,000,000 worth of industrial equipment, machine tools, and things of that sort. How do you reconcile that conduct with this plea by the President to stop Russian communism in Greece and Turkey?

Mr. TABER. I am in favor of stopping Russian communism in Greece and Turkey, but I believe we cannot expect Russia to take us seriously unless we stand up for the right and move in just one direction and unless our State Department and our administration moves in one direction alone.

This is just exactly like the operations of the President in blowing hot and cold on the question of communism in the Departments. On March 22 the President issued an Executive order providing means for getting rid of Communists in the Government and asking for about \$45,000,000 to do it.

The situation very evidently is, in his opinion, serious at the present time. On February 28, 1947, he wrote a letter to former Governor Earle, of Pennsylvania, saying:

People are very much wrought up about the Communist "bugaboo," but I am of the opinion that the country is perfectly safe, so far as communism is concerned—we have too many sane people. Our Government is made for the welfare of the people, and I don't believe there will come a time when anyone will really want to overturn it.

This indicates that the President does not appreciate fully the dangers we are in from Russia.

Why cannot he stop export licenses to Russian occupied territory and move in one direction on our foreign affairs?

No more apt proof could be asked on the incompetence of the Democratic Party to govern.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDONOUGH). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

COAL PRODUCTION IN EUROPE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be divided into three separate statements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] made a very able statement regarding our international affairs. I would like to state that last August or September I took up with one of the President's chief advisers the question of the mining of coal in the Ruhr area in Germany. At that time, lower than 100,000,000 tons of coal were being mined. My understanding is there are only 109,000,000 tons of coal being mined in Germany today. That is only about half of the coal output that could be secured in Germany if those in charge were willing to use more influence in getting the coal out of the mines. I think the British are in charge of that area at the

present time. It would make an enormous difference in the conditions in France, for instance. France could secure more coal that way. France herself at that time was not getting all the coal out of the mines that could be secured. I understand that situation has been cleared up somewhat.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that about the same number of miners operating in Germany as we have in this country produce only about 20 percent of our production?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is absolutely correct, showing that there is something radically wrong in the way the production is managed. I am not entirely sure. Perhaps the gentleman has figures on whether all the coal is being mined in France today that could be mined.

Mr. TABER. I think in France they are up to somewhere around 80 percent of what might be expected, but in Germany they are producing only about 50 percent of what is expected, and they are only producing one-fifth as much per miner as we produce in this country, which is absolutely ridiculous.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. It seems ridiculous and worse than that that we should be shipping coal abroad when we have needed it very much recently in our own country. Over in France last winter there was very great suffering, and there was suffering in England from the intense cold weather and the shortage of coal. We have shipped coal abroad at great expense when it was needed at home. Again I say coal should and must be mined in foreign countries. The gentleman agrees that undoubtedly warm people are much less liable to become Communist than people who are suffering from the cold. I think it would have a great deal to do with stabilizing conditions abroad if coal could be mined in every country where it is possible to secure it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I am very glad the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is working on this matter. The gentleman is a tireless worker. It seems to me there is no reason why this country should not insist that coal in Europe be mined.

CANCER CONTROL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch on a matter that relates to the control of cancer. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that as a part of my remarks I may include a condensed article in Hygeia by Lois Maddox Miller.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

THE SMALL TOWNS TACKLE CANCER

(Condensed from Hygeia)

(By Lois Mattox Miller)

The most original caravan ever to pioneer the roads of Oklahoma is a big school bus

that has been converted into a mobile cancer clinic. Inside, it is partitioned off into four completely equipped examining rooms, each presided over by a specialist—a surgeon, an internist, a skin specialist, and a gynecologist. Efficient white-clad nurses stand by.

This cancer-detection unit, the first of its kind in the United States, is Oklahoma's answer to the need in rural regions for a medical service that can spot cancer in time to arrest it. The Oklahoma chapter of the American Cancer Society converted the bus; the State Medical Society rounded up specialists to serve on a rotating basis, and the State nurses association supplied nurses. An itinerary which blankets the State was drawn up, and advance publicity was spread by newspaper and radio. Local doctors were urged to visit the clinic and learn the latest cancer-detection techniques.

Oklahoma's solution of the problem is typical of the resourcefulness shown in the small towns' war against cancer. Sylacauga, Ala. (population 6,300), arranged to have a cancer clinic added to the hospital facilities of the nearby Avondale Mills. Semiannual examinations are now routine for both employees and the general public.

In Parsons, Kans. (population 18,000), a committee enlisted the support of fraternal organizations and women's clubs to provide Mercy Hospital with a full-fledged clinic. The widow of a prominent businessman who had died of cancer started the drive with a check for \$2,000; benefits and public collections raised \$12,000 more. By the time doctors had been lined up to serve in the clinic, a modern 250,000-volt X-ray had been installed. Parsons is now prepared not only to spot early cancer but to treat detected cases.

In Mineola, a suburb of New York City, Dr. Evelyn V. Berg, head of the Nassau-Suffolk Planned Parenthood Center, had been providing routine pelvic examinations of married women. Why not also check them for indications of cancer?

Of the first 1,000 women thus examined, 525 were sent to their own doctors or to clinics for further examination. Throughout the United States there are over 500 similar planned-parenthood centers, each of which could become a powerful instrument for cancer prevention. That possibility is now to be realized.

The most heartening thing about all these brave projects is that today none of them needs to languish for financial support. Last year the Nation-wide campaign of the American Cancer Society raised more than \$10,000,000. This year the goal of the drive that will run through April (designated by Congress as cancer-control month) is \$12,000,000. Of this sum, 60 percent will remain in the State where it is raised, to be used by chapters of the society to carry on their vital work. The remainder will be used by the national organization for the research program now under way in scores of laboratories.

Recently New York's Memorial Hospital opened the first cancer-prevention clinic for children. Few people think of cancer as a children's disease, yet it outranks diphtheria, measles, polio, and rheumatic fever as a killer. This means that children must be added to the hosts of women, and the increasing number of men, whose names crowd the appointment lists of the cancer-detective agencies. Can the doctors cope with the job? Well, 2 years ago many experts regarded broad-scale cancer detection in small towns as almost impossible. And look at it now. Resourcefulness is what counts—and triumphs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Some years ago the House passed my bill which authorized the President to declare the month of April Cancer Control Month. He was to issue a proclamation stating that all organizations, all newspapers, all radio stations, all means of communication should be used for the dissemination of information concerning the control of cancer. As a result of that each year in the month of April there has been a concerted drive against cancer. Last year under the direction of Mr. Eric Johnston, chairman of the drive, \$10,000,000 was raised. This year the goal of the drive in April is to be \$12,000,000. Of the sums raised, 60 percent will remain in the State where it is raised to be used by the chapters of the society to carry on their commendable work of cancer research and control. The remainder will be used by the national organization for the research program now under way in scores of laboratories.

Recently New York's Memorial Hospital opened the first cancer-prevention clinic for children. Few people think of cancer as a children's disease, yet it outranks diphtheria, measles, polio, and rheumatic fever as a killer. This means that children must be added to the hosts of women, and the increasing number of men, whose names crowd the appointment lists of the cancer-detective agencies.

This article I spoke of mentions the cancer drive in Oklahoma and some other communities' educational drives. And they are very effective.

I have always been grateful to Senator GEORGE, the member of another body—I believe I can speak of him and it in this connection—for securing the passage of this cancer-control bill that passed in the Senate in just 24 hours.

CONTROL OF BARBITURATES

Mr. Speaker, last year I introduced a bill, and I have done so again this year, for the purpose of controlling the use of barbiturates and derivatives of phenobarbital, requiring a doctor's prescription for their use.

I do not believe it is generally known how many persons have become addicts to the use of phenobarbital and its derivatives. People do not realize that it is a cumulative drug which stays in the system. If a person takes too much of it he will become an addict. This shows the need for its use only by prescription. Barbiturates have even changed personalities. Right here in the city of Washington there have been two deaths due to overdoses of barbiturates. I have letters from all over the country telling of persons who have become addicts without realizing what they were doing.

The managers of drug stores themselves are becoming very much worried because so many people use barbiturates without a doctor's prescription or direction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks an article that appeared in the New York

Times on April 3 entitled "Barbiturate Curb Backed by Doctors."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe that the object of the bill is approved by every doctor—at least by all those of whom I have any knowledge, and also by pharmaceutical organizations. They realize that if they sell these drugs it will hurt the drug stores and the drug industry apart from killing many persons. How frequently when you pick up a newspaper or magazine you read of some person who has died from an overdose of these drugs. They seem very innocent. The other day a woman told me that whenever her baby was a little fretful she gave it a dose of phenobarbital. I asked her if she had a doctor's prescription and she said "No."

We must do something to curb this abuse. The only real remedy I know is Federal legislation. The States are passing legislation too slowly.

The article from the New York Times is as follows:

BARBITURATE CURB BACKED BY DOCTORS— MANUFACTURERS, PHARMACISTS OPPOSE PLAN TO AMEND CITY SANITARY CODE

The barbiturate addict is just as much a danger to society as the narcotic addict, Dr. Charles Solomon of the Kings County Medical Society declared yesterday at a hearing by the board of health on proposed legislation for the control of the sale of barbiturates, the sedatives known commonly as sleeping pills.

Health Commissioner Israel Weinstein called the hearing at the Health Department Building, 125 Worth Street, to outline his proposals for amendment of the Sanitary Code in regard to barbiturates, and to permit spokesmen for pharmaceutical manufacturers, pharmacists, physicians, and hospitals to voice their opinions of the new program.

All speakers agreed on the need for stricter control of barbiturate sales. When it came to the health department program, however, opinion was divided, with the pharmaceutical manufacturers and pharmacists lined up almost solidly against it, and most of the doctors favoring it.

WOULD CURB REFILLS

Under the proposed amendments, prescriptions for barbiturates could not be refilled unless the doctor so ordered in writing on the prescription. The State law now in operation permits the refilling for 6 months unless the doctor specifically orders the prescription not to be refilled.

Pharmacists would be required to keep records of purchases and sale of barbiturates, as well as an original inventory. This would be required of wholesalers also. Neither of these provisions is made in the State law.

Pharmacists would be required to keep barbiturate prescriptions on file for 5 years and be prohibited from filling telephone orders for more than six doses. The State law does not limit telephone orders, although it requires pharmacists to report physicians who fail to provide a written prescription for a telephone order within 72 hours.

Supporting Dr. Solomon, Dr. Harry Gold, of the Cornell Medical College, said that barbiturates are habit-forming drugs in the purest sense.

"They produce dependence indistinguishable in many respects from dependence on morphine and opiates," he asserted. "Anything that would make them more difficult to come by would have a salutary effect."

Col. Garland H. Williams, Chief of the eastern division, Federal Narcotics Bureau, declared that more than 90 percent of persons involved in the violation of narcotic laws used barbiturates also. The chief objections to the proposed legislation, he added, were its weakness and the difficulty of enforcing it.

"Laws based on good faith are hardly worth the paper they are written on," he said. "Laws are not written for people anxious to do the right thing, but for those who are not going to act in good faith. Not only would this law be ineffective, but it would be absolutely unenforceable."

The law, as now written, would not provide control of barbiturates at the manufacturing level, he noted, urging inclusion of controls similar to those provided in existing narcotic legislation. On questioning by Board of Health members, he said he did not believe that the proposed amendments would be harmful.

Representatives of the pharmacists and the manufacturers suggested that action be deferred until the State Legislature could consider the present laws. For the sake of uniformity of regulations, they held, all legislation should be on the State level.

Commissioner Weinstein, in a statement issued after the hearing, declared that the Department of Health would continue to enforce existing controls. It will present to the Board of Health at its meeting on Tuesday its recommendations for more stringent control, he added, asking that final action be deferred until the May meeting to give interested persons and associations time to present additional material.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania, for 7 days, from April 7 to April 14, on account of official business.

To Mr. HESLTON, for April 9 and April 10, on account of official business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 8, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1327. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period;

H. R. 1621. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of paid passports;

H. R. 1713. An act to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1943. An act to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 10, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

524. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to transfer to the employees' compensation fund the payment of benefits in certain cases arising under the civilian war-benefits program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

525. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. EATON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 153. Joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war; without amendment (Rept. No. 239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEALL: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1997. A bill to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2846. A bill authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building; without amendment (Rept. No. 241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington: H. R. 2978. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to Siam and to make them racially eligible for naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON: H. R. 2979. A bill to provide direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of \$65 per month to needy citizens 55 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NORTON: H. R. 2980. A bill to raise the minimum wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON: H. R. 2981. A bill to authorize registered owners of United States savings bonds to change the beneficiaries of such bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2982. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the acquisition and development of systems of State parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida: H. R. 2983. A bill to provide that the expiration date of the subscription shall appear on the label or wrapper accompanying each piece of second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 2984. A bill to amend the act of June 1, 1910, so as to regulate the installation of radio or television transmitting antennas, masts, or other structures in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 2985. A bill relating to appointments of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 2986. A bill to provide for the selection for elimination and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 2987. A bill to provide for renewal of certain copyrights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2988. A bill to amend an act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of international conventions, and for other purposes, approved July 5, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 2989. A bill to provide for award of accrued pension, compensation, or retirement pay authorized under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration in the event of a veteran's death; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNEY (by request):

H. R. 2990. A bill to provide automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 2991. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to permit assignments of insurance benefits by widows or widowers who have remarried; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2992. A bill to grant certain veterans the benefits of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2993. A bill to authorize the appointment of certain additional permanent major generals and brigadier generals of the line of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 2994. A bill to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to execute and deliver to present owners of real property quitclaim deeds to the minerals in or under such property reserved by the United States pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 2995. A bill to provide annuities for certain former postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 2996. A bill to authorize an appropriation for public-school facilities at Owyhee, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SARBACHER:

H. R. 2997. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 2998. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 2999. A bill to furnish financial assistance to victims of the mine disasters at Centralia, Ill., and Straight Creek, Ky.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3000. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 so as to provide terms of office for members of the Council of Economic Advisers; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 3001. A bill to provide further safeguards with respect to the issuance of passports by or under the authority of the Secretary of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 3002. A bill to increase the rates of service pension for veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 174. A resolution to authorize the printing of 13,000 additional copies of House Report 238; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 175. A resolution to authorize payment of \$350.84 on vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments under authority of Public Law 601, rule XI; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 27 of the Jones Act to remove the present discrimination therein contained against the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing and enabling the United States to cooperate with the Republic of Mexico in checking the spread of the hoof-and-mouth disease of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation reasonably restricting the importation into the United States of foreign crab meat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to continue the availability of funds provided for airport construction in Hawaii as legalized by Public Law 377, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 3003. A bill for the relief of Szale Kacowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 3004. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Henryk Zaleski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 3005. A bill to provide for the payment of a retirement annuity to Hedley E. Redmyer; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3006. A bill for the relief of Laura Spinnichia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Ernest F. Lutzken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 3008. A bill for the relief of J. S. Kirby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 3009. A bill for the relief of Adolph Grabowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 3010. A bill for the relief of Florence Bryant Peters and E. B. Peters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3011. A bill for the relief of Angelo Miletto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3012. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Nintean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SARBACHER:

H. R. 3013. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 3014. A bill for the relief of James L. Stice; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

307. By Mr. KEARNEY: Resolution concurred in by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of New York, requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation with the effect of empowering without restrictions each State to provide in accordance with its needs for the financing from State sources of its unemployment insurance and employment service programs, either through taxation under its unemployment insurance law or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

308. Also, resolution concurred in by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of New York urging the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 577 or similar legislation designed to safeguard existing military graveyards that are given proper and adequate care by States and/or communities wherein they are located; to the Committee on Public Lands.

309. By Mr. NORBLAD: House Joint Memorial No. 18 of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning and urging the Congress of the United States to enact certain amendments to the grants-in-aid programs of the Federal Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

310. Also, Senate Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing and enabling the United States to cooperate with the Republic of Mexico in checking the spread of the highly contagious, infectious, and injurious disease of cattle and other livestock, known as epizootic apthra or, more commonly, hoof-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

311. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 19 of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation reasonably restricting the importation into the United States of foreign crab meat, and defining that term to include not only crab meat produced in foreign waters, but also crab meat produced, processed, canned, marketed, or distributed by foreign nationals outside the United States and Alaska; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

312. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Department of New Jersey, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, recommending that adequate funds be appropriated to enable all Air Reserve officers who desire to maintain and increase their flying skill and proficiency to do so, and urging the continued maintenance of adequate Air Reserve flying training facilities at the Newark Municipal Airport until such time as equally adequate and accessible facilities are made available for such Air Reserve flying training; to the Committee on Appropriations.

313. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution passed by executive committee, Department of Wisconsin, American Legion, on September 30, 1947, endorsing Camp McCoy, Wis., as a permanent military training center; to the Committee on Armed Services.

314. Also, petition of a group of citizens of Kenosha, Wis., protesting against the proposed loans to Turkey as being against the best interests of American democracy and world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

315. Also, petition of a group of citizens in the First Congressional District of Wisconsin urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

316. Also, petition of groups of citizens in First Congressional District of Wisconsin urging that communism in this country be stopped and stamped out completely; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

317. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles Van Newkirk, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of grievances; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

318. Also, petition of H. C. Curtis and others (members of West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 1), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

319. Also, petition of Austin L. Love and others (members of West Palm Beach Townsend Club, No. 3), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

320. Also, petition of H. C. Curtis and others (delegates from the Townsend Clubs of the Sixth Congressional District of Florida), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we give Thee thanks for good weather and the lovely promises of spring. We thank Thee for good health, good friends, and all the things we so often take for granted. We thank Thee for the keen challenges of

this hour, for work to do that demands the best we have and still finds us inadequate. Then may we seek Thy help, knowing that in partnership with Thee, in applying Thy will to our problems, there shall be no dull moments and no problems beyond solution. God bless us all and help us to be right and to do right. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 9, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 516) to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 547) to provide for annual and sick leave for rural letter carriers, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 603. An act to amend an act of September 27, 1944, relating to credit for military or naval service in connection with certain homestead entries;

H. R. 1098. An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation;

H. R. 1099. An act to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe;

H. R. 1350. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes";

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States Naval Government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve;